

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3.

NOVEMBER, 1890.

No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

MINISTRY IN CITIES.

BY REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

PAUL WENTWORTH, the spy, in one of his confidential communications to Eden, in 1776, said of the American colonies that in many of them there was never a pauper seen, and that many of them did not know what a poor-rate was. We have come bravely beyond that now. Yet there is no doubt that Wentworth's statement was then true. Indeed, he did not want to exaggerate on that side. Had he overstated, it would have been to the disparagement of the colonies. As States and as a nation, we have come bravely beyond the condition of Wentworth's Arcadia. But there are now, up and down in this country, communities of a considerable size of which the same thing could be said which he said of whole colonies. I have once and again visited county jails in Massachusetts where there was no prisoner. I remember the summer when it was seriously proposed to rent the poorhouse in Milton, Massachusetts, to summer boarders. They might easily have found worse quarters, for it was in an exquisite situation. Few of our readers will not recall places where the charity society of the Church, eager to be of use, has to send its contributions for the good of some city charity, simply because the town has no paupers of its own.

Speaking roughly, it is safe to say that the difficulty increases with the population of a village or town. There is more pauperism and there is more crime in a town of twenty thousand people than in a town of one thousand—and the excess goes far beyond the proportion which these figures indicate. In the town of a hundred thousand people, the number would have increased again over the ratio of the town of ten thousand.

In handling the difficulty thus presented, the Church of Christ has this disadvantage—that these large cities, rapidly gathered,

are, on the whole, a modern invention, and that the Church has not a very large experience from which to select her best methods of attack in suppressing such an evil. All the same, the Church has this thing to do. She says that she represents Jesus Christ, and that he has power to take away the sins of the world. She says that his name was given him for this reason. Now, for a generation or so, when you say to the leaders of the Church, "Why do you not take away the sins of Boston, of New York, or of Scranton?" she may answer, in a puzzled way, "I am going to. I am setting to work on this. But I have not got ready. You must give me time."

Meanwhile, as I have said, the Church does point, with a just pride and complacency, to what she does and has done in small districts, where she could inspect the whole ground and could have her own way. John Frederic Oberlin knew how to administer his parish so that there were no paupers and no criminals there. My own grandfather, Enoch Hale, of Northampton, had the moral and spiritual oversight of a township in which lived six or seven hundred people. For those people he ministered. That means, in the world's language, he took the spiritual and moral care of them. He did this by going daily from district to district, from house to house. Literally he knew by sight and by name every person in that township. He advised, in every one of a hundred families, what should be done with that boy or this girl. As the result of such a supervision as that, there was again no criminal and no pauper. I have his diary for half a century, and I do not believe there are ten notices of crime in the whole parish. It was his business to take care of those people. And he took care of them.

I venture to say that ten years would pass

without any person in that community of six or eight hundred people being brought before the courts to answer either for debt or for any crime. If there were any one in the poorhouse, it was some aged man or woman, or perhaps some aged couple, who could be better cared for in that central establishment, where "the town" in general could show its interest in them, than in their own separate and perhaps distant home.

Now I certainly do not mean that one man, by his own service, kept people thus from beggary or from crime. No. But he had behind him the backing of "the town." This means that all the intelligent and conscientious people in that town had confidence in his opinion in matters of destitution, temptation, or need, and were ready and willing to take a fair share in relieving the town from such dangers where they existed. I want to call attention to the fact that there was one person who surveyed the whole ground, and that it was not possible that the first steps should be taken toward crime or pauperism, but he observed them, and could call attention to them.

What followed was a condition of things in which poor-rates were unheard of and poor-laws unknown.

In our day we have no such state of things in our cities, and scarcely any remnant of such a condition in our country parishes. Indeed, the word "parish" has wholly lost its meaning. It is no longer a territorial expression. It means a company of worshippers who, with more or less definiteness, have united themselves in one religious society. To a certain oversight of this "parish" a clergyman is appointed, and he does what he can as the moral and spiritual adviser of these people. But their homes are scattered from King's Bridge, it may be, to Staten Island. And for the others, who, for whatever reason, have not united themselves with any religious society, there is no pretext of regular moral or spiritual oversight. The "mission chapels" in a city like New York are established with a certain hope of accomplishing something like what the country parson did, as matter of professional privilege and duty, for every one. But how little this is appears at once when we are told that the "Assembly Precinct," in which is the "Rivington Street Settlement," has five chapels only for fifty thousand people. It is a beginning, but only a beginning in the right direction. Now there is very little use in launching the bow of a ship alone. Unless you can

launch the whole of her, you had better keep the bow on the stocks until you can.

Mr. W. H. McElroy, in an admirable parable which has been widely circulated, told how Rev. Matthew Middlemas approached this problem, and described the success which he and his condjutors attained. His plan was a loyal co-operation of all the churches in a town "to take away the sins of the world." By their co-operation the twelve churches in that town were able to achieve much more than twelve times what any one church could achieve alone. I believe that with the advance of Christianity some such plan will be worked out in the small cities or large towns of America. And the moment it is successfully carried out in one, that town will be the centre of the curious and grateful study of the Christian world.

The practical difficulty of that plan at this moment is, that hardly one of our churches is organized with a view to practical charity or helpfulness among the neighbors. There are good experiments in those directions. Such a church as St. George's, in New York City, or as the Barnard Memorial, in Boston, shows what can be done. But, on the whole, the organization of activity in our churches, of whatever communion, looks first to the quickening of the religious life of the worshippers; second, to the work of foreign missions; third, to the study of the theory of Christian philanthropy. Then the real, practical work of opening the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, of clothing the naked and proclaiming glad tidings to the poor, is not undertaken by the Church as an organization, but is left to the intelligence and sensibility of individuals as they have been quickened by the energies thus set in order.

The charity organization societies do enough to show where the weak spot in our system is, but from the nature of their organization they do not fill the gap which they disclose. I do not myself believe that the gap will be filled till the Church of Christ devotes itself systematically to the business, and when it does, I think it will prove that its success is on the old lines, of personal oversight by consecrated men and women, carried out so far that every person in the district in hand may be under the direct personal and intelligent supervision of somebody. There shall be somebody to see when a boy or girl is led into tempta-

tion, a
may be
I ha
crowd
a pop
ple.
synag
the S
The f
Roma
small
They
from
the M
thirty
ward
ish."
ten m
Bes
asylu
dren'
ties,
purpo
No
minis
least
mitte
Pray
"rec
overs
What
wher
Any
that
roug
make
man
any
is di
O
quir
have
distr
thes
man
than
said
ent
old-
sma
and
but
my
san
I
tail
spe
agin
As
thi

tion, and somebody to contrive how they may be delivered from evil.

I have in my mind one of the more crowded wards in the city of Boston, with a population, say, of twenty thousand people. In this ward are three churches, one synagogue, and close to it a strong post of the Salvation Army and another church. The five churches thus named are: one Roman Catholic, two Congregational, one a small Methodist chapel, and one Episcopal. They are attended mostly by worshippers from outside the ward. Thus the pastor of the Methodist Church told me that but thirty-seven families or individuals in the ward had any connection with his "parish." I think the five churches maintain ten ministers.

Besides these churches, there is an orphan asylum for ninety girls; there is a children's mission, and two or three local charities, which have more or less to do with the purpose we have in hand.

Now, under the old-fashioned system of ministry which I have been describing, at least twenty "ministers," if I may be permitted to use the word of the Bible and the Prayer-Book, instead of the more elegant "rector" or "pastor," would have the oversight of these twenty thousand people. What is important is, each man would know where his people were and who they were. Any working minister will agree with me that one thousand persons, or, speaking roughly, one hundred and thirty families, make the outside number for which any one man, with his wife, ought to feel himself in any sort responsible, when such supervision is discussed as we are speaking of.

Observe that in place of the twenty required there are, in fact, but ten, and they have much more than the charge of this district or ward given to them. Not one of these five churches but has two thirds as many "parishioners" from outside the ward than it has within it, and the same may be said of the Jewish synagogue. The present provision, then, of "ministry," in the old-fashioned use of the word, meets only a small proportion of the people of the ward, and for them the ministers in charge have but half the time and resource which, on my estimate of one minister for one thousand people, they demand.

I give this definite instance in such detail, because it is a great deal better to speak of an actual case than to describe imaginary successes in imaginary paradises. As it happens, also, I know personally something of the ward, for a part of it comes into

District K, which is the section of Boston entrusted to the South Congregational Church, of which I am minister, by the plans of our Conference.

With this knowledge, after an experience of thirty-four years in work on this very territory, let me say what I would there do now if I were a bishop who thought he had any responsibility for the region, whether Catholic, Episcopalian, Methodist, or Congregationalist.

1. I would visit the Jewish rabbi, the Catholic clergy, the Episcopalian "rector," the Unitarian minister, the other Congregational minister, and the Methodist "pastor," as I observe he calls himself. I would say to them, "We propose to find out what is the moral and spiritual condition of this ward; we propose to keep the people in it out of temptation as well as we can, and to deliver them from evil as far as the good God will help us. For this purpose we are going to make a list of them, and to know who takes care of them. Will you give us a list of the families where you have any personal oversight which you wish to retain? For we have our hands full, and we do not want to interfere with anybody else."

2. They would give me these lists; and they would include about one sixth of the families of the ward. They would include very few of the floating population—young men and young women who are boarders in families or hire single rooms. For such people do not readily connect themselves with the formal religious organizations.

3. Roughly speaking, the ward contains 2500 households, averaging 7 persons each, 1500 single men and women living separately. Of these, possibly 300 households and 300 single men and women would prove to be regular "parishioners" of my 10 clergymen, and may be subtracted from those "we" have to provide for. And we must have one minister or overseer for each 120 families. For 2200 families and 1200 other persons we must provide about 20 more ministers than we have, if we mean to do this thing as thoroughly as it is done where men succeed in doing it. I mean that I would assign to each of these ministers 110 families or thereabouts, and 60 of the separate single persons.

4. I should proceed, not to appoint these twenty ministers, but to see that the right persons did appoint them.

I should not think I had half done my task when one half were appointed.

I should not think I had done a quarter

of it when one quarter of the number were appointed.

Indeed, if I could not launch the whole ship, I would not launch it at all.

5. I should proceed in some such way as this. I should hire a large old-fashioned house and place in it an intelligent old-fashioned Minister. He should be a man who had outgrown the boyish passion for preaching, and who knew the inestimable worth of ministry.

He should be a consecrated Christian man, able to bear his cross this morning, and willing to be crucified this afternoon—a man willing to make himself of no reputation, and who really believed that “whoever would be first among you should be your minister.” He should have a wife like himself, and they two should live in this house, supervise our ministry to the ward, and make the house its cathedral or headquarters.

Into this house I should admit seven or eight younger men who were willing to do what they were told to do by the Chief of Staff, who is the minister above described. To them, according to the time they gave to this work, should be assigned a certain number of families, of whom they had the oversight, for whom they were the ministers.

In a somewhat similar establishment I should place, for their residence, seven or eight women, experienced in ministry, and willing to devote their lives to the service in hand.

We should thus be provided with fifteen or sixteen of the ministers needed. The other four or five would live in their own homes, having been selected for special service, as will appear.

6. The first business of the Chief of Staff thus engaged in the King's service would be to make, by his agents, an exact census of each of the houses and tenement-houses in his ward. It would give the name and age of every person, it would tell what school every child attended, what church satisfied the people who had “any religion to speak of.”

He would assign to the ten ministers whom he had found at work in the ward the three hundred families and three hundred other “parishioners” whom they had named as now connected with their respective churches.

He would then go to the Catholic bishop of Boston, the Episcopal bishop, the Methodist bishop, the Moderator of the Suffolk Conference and the minister of the Berkley Street Church, and he would ask each of

them to name a clergyman or visitor of his own communion to reside in the ward and be ready to administer the sacraments or give other religious advice and comfort needed in all cases which might require. We should thus have a special minister at hand, who would be ready to meet the special religious needs of those under our care. These five would live where they pleased, and would not be under the restrictions of our two houses. We should now have the twenty ministers whom the work of the ward requires.

To each of these men the Chief of Staff would assign 110 families and 60 single persons or thereabouts, grouped as closely together as possible. In that ward there are two or three tenement-houses which would alone make such a “parish.” The man to whom such a group was assigned would regard it as his special business, or the woman who had such a group would regard that as hers. To get acquainted with these people would be the first object of their lives. They would succeed or fail according to their success in getting acquainted. They would find what schools the children attended, how the teachers liked them and rated them. They would find what clubs the men frequented. They would look in, with one or another errand, at their places of work. In any case of sickness or other distress they would be ready with any friendly offices. If they got chances, they would visit the people of their groups; but this, of course, would come only in time and with proper opportunity. They would study the arrests, the hospital entries, and the trials in court daily, to see if any of their charge were in trouble. Each would keep a careful record of his thousand sheep and lambs, and know, as often as once a week, where they were. The right people, with the right instinct for ministry, would get up their lists within a month's time of their appointments.

Before long they would have a just ambition and rivalry in keeping their lists white and strong. In proportion as they knew their boys and girls, would they be mortified that any one of those boys and girls was in arrest, or was drunk, or was turned out of school. When a boy left school and went to work, his own minister would know where he went and why he went there, would see that the bargain was fair, and that the boy had a chance. As boy or girl came to the age when children like to be out of evenings, and careless parents let them go, here would be somebody

with
amus

An
clerg
body
woul
sight
what
woul
its
ment
arran
inter
be al
licen
fuse
The
publ
the
a w
ever
a tw
sigh
busi
with
tha

T
as l
two
visi
des
onc
the
wit
suc
rol
sor
we

wh

we

wh

oc
in
lic
St
th

co

so

St

c

f

a

s

with an eye on the evening occupations and amusements of the neighborhood.

And here, counting in the resident clergy, already ten in number, would be a body of thirty people whose business in life would be to keep a moral and spiritual oversight of this ward. They would oversee what are called its "charities." They would interest themselves in measures for its higher education, for public amusements, for drainage and other sanitary arrangements. They would not be above interfering in its local politics. They would be able to present very strong reasons to the licensing board, if it were necessary, to refuse or to grant a license to a liquor-dealer. They would stand by each other in any public affair which needed pressure upon the community or upon the authorities. In a word, where it is now the business of every one of twelve hundred voters to take a twelve-hundredth part of the moral oversight of that ward, it would then be the business of a union of thirty people, acting with a common sense of duty, to see that that oversight was thoroughly carried on.

The Chief of Staff and the Lady Superior, as I will call them, who are the heads of the two houses, would have the general supervision of the work which I have tried to describe. I should suggest that as often as once a week all the "ministers" under their direction should be called together, with as many of the others as could come to such a meeting. I should suggest that the roll should then be called—first, of all persons who had died in the ward in the last week.

"Mr. Smith, James McCloskey died; what were the circumstances?"

"Mrs. Jones, Bernard Baum died; what were the circumstances?"

"Mr. Anders, Hans Andersen died; what were the circumstances?"

If these various deaths brought out any occasion of family distress, which it was not in the power of that special minister to relieve, that would be a case for the Chief of Staff to refer to higher and stronger authorities.

Next should come the record of the courts.

"Mrs. Oberlin, I see that a woman was sentenced to the Island for six months. She is one of your people. What are the circumstances?" And so on.

Third, would come the cases of removal from the ward, and perhaps the sending of a proper note of introduction to some person in the place to which they had removed.

Fourth, would come an inquiry as to the

persons who had moved into the ward. For if this business were properly done, there would not be a stranger entering the ward to live but, before a week was over, his name would be properly registered on the registry of the Chief of Staff.

This is the way any business is administered which is carried on in a business-like way. This is the sort of care, for instance, which is taken of a corps in the army; it is the sort of oversight by which the work-people in a large factory are superintended; it is the same regimen which is applied in a great public school. I see no reason why the Church of Christ should not make it her pride to have a similar watchfulness over the people who have been entrusted to her charge. I do not think that this watchfulness is sufficiently maintained under our present sporadic system—in which, with infinite waste of time, each person takes up a special and separated case, without any confidence that he is supported by those who are on the right hand and on the left hand.

I have said nothing of the expense of carrying out such a system. I do not believe that the expense need stand in the way of it for a moment, if the system is the right system. The Church does not mean to be balked at home while she is carrying on her victories abroad. What she needs is to bestow the same care on her enterprises at home that she would bestow on her enterprises abroad.

A rough estimate of the expense of the plan I have supposed would be this:

Rent of the two houses which are the centres of work, say.....	\$2,400 00
Salaries of the Chief of Staff and Lady Superior, say.....	5,000 00
Board and salary of 20 "ministers," men and women, at, say, \$600 each annually.....	12,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$19,400 00

For their charities, their hospital expenses, their medicines, their reading-rooms, their libraries, and the rest, they would rely on the well-organized charities of the city as they already exist.

I believe that, with such a system of supervision, the whole tone of this ward would be changed at once. I think that gradually the separate ministers would find they were able to report absolutely "clean lists" week by week—by which I mean lists on which there was no person who had died from hunger, or from drunkenness, or from

neglect, and in which no person had appeared before the courts. There is many and many a parish minister who will read these lines who knows that from his own parish, in the last year, nobody has been sent to prison, nobody has starved, and nobody has died of negligence. I know no reason why, with the proper supervision, the same thing should not be said of such parishes as I am attempting to provide for, and as I have been trying to describe.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE IMPOTENCE AND THE RIGHT USE OF IMAGINATION IN DEALING WITH CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN STEINFORT KEDNEY,
D.D., SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAUT, MINNESOTA.

IN the article which follows I endeavor to point out the source of many of the untenable or incoherent views of Christian doctrine which have been hindrances in the way of advance in theologic science.

I give only a specimen, for to treat the topic exhaustively would require the composition of a treatise, which I may at some day undertake. There would thus be furnished another evidence that the solution of all problems, whether of physical science, psychology, or theology, depends upon the philosophy or ideal construction of the whole fabric of knowledge, which is implicit in the mind of one who attempts it. He who endeavors to build up his system upon exegetical or historic grounds solely is quite as much dominated by his philosophy as he who pursues any other method.

Imagination is commonly spoken or written of as the *representative* faculty—that which takes up the impressions derived through the senses, and which have become perceptions by falling into the moulds supplied by the understanding, and reproduces them in consciousness as accurately as possible, or recombines them into a new result having apparent unity, so as to present them thus to the mind for its work or its play.

The linking together the material supplied by memory, in a loose or arbitrary way, is sometimes called *Fancy*; while the unifying of this content so as to produce a self-consistent whole has been spoken of as the work of *Imagination* proper, thus distinguished. Both mental movements are

partly spontaneous and partly deliberate. The passivity is only seeming. The activity is actual even in the most apparent spontaneity, and may consist in its lowest degree merely in the will's refraining from any interference with the play of association, and holding the mind steady during this riot of images. But a more manifestly wilful procedure is when the mind yields to the attraction to pass beyond itself, to infuse itself into the image, and reproduce itself in its life; when it *becomes*, as it were, for the time being that which it contemplates. This activity is always accompanied by emotion, a kind of melting of the individual life into the universal life, or that of some of its concretions. Thus *Imagination* comes to be called the *creative* faculty.

Manifestly in all these procedures the mind deals only with the concrete, with ideas or thoughts which have been made real and sensible. When by pure thinking the abstract idea has been disengaged, it becomes matter for thought solely; and *Imagination* is robbed of its material. It can do nothing with the naked ideas except by clothing them again with the body which has been abstracted. But so habitual and constant in every human being has become its exercise, that it vainly or revengefully still continues to intrude into the region of the pure ideas, annuls the abstraction, blinds itself to the fact that it has done so; engaging the mind meanwhile to draw inferences only valid if the abstraction has not been made; and thus beclouds or distorts the ideas themselves. All which has been the source of constant mistake or confusion in many mental endeavors, as well as in the meditation upon distinctively religious truth. Thus *Imagination* is a faculty which more than any other needs restraining and regulating, and to have its proper function clearly defined.

It would be interesting, in this connection, to make a comparison, so far as it can be made, between this faculty in the brute (which manifestly possesses and uses it) and in the human being; between its exercise when dealing with material undetermined by spirit-relations, and with that so determined. But this would be an independent and a large topic.

The faculty of *Imagination* is a universal human possession, yet exists in individuals in different degrees of activity. Probably its degrees are ruled by physical or physiological conditions rather than by spiritual ones. On account of these it varies in quickness and vividness, and in the extent of its range; yet in every one it is in con-

stant activity, mediates the whole passage from abstract consciousness to any act of will, presents the immediate or remote result which gives end and impetus to action. It sometimes carries the mind out of itself so completely as to reduce the pure thought power almost to passivity, to make the man the victim of some image or ideal presentation which alone he sees, to the exclusion of everything else. This fact must affect his actual responsibility, and teaches us that to judge of the absolute moral worth of a man or his actions is no superficial problem, but one requiring no less than the Divine insight.

The errors, delusions, superstitions, impure or incoherent philosophies which have been so rife in human history, all probably owe their origin largely to the misuse of Imagination.

To exhibit some of the unfortunate results of its dealing with theological doctrines, or problems related thereto, to show thus its impotence, and then to point out and limit its true function in dealing with such matter, is my present design.

All the object-matter with which Imagination may successfully deal is contained in space. These bounded spaces, made real by the senses of sight and touch, are its proper material. But Imagination tries to compass the absolute space itself, to try its wing in the illimitable. It projects the self-consciousness into the infinite abyss, passes beyond the planets and stars and systems, to which it must give relative location; passes beyond them, to find itself in pure vacancy, with an interminable distance before it, rendered no less by any speed or any duration of time. It must abandon the endeavor, and confess its impotence, in dealing with absolute space. Instead of concluding, then, that pure space is not for Imagination, but for pure thought only, the mind, as represented by this faculty, still abides in its delusion, and supplies further objects on which it may rest, after the exhaustion of its known objects supplies an attenuated ether, or locates a far-distant heaven or paradise or hell; all which inventions may become delusions, not necessarily mischievous, but certainly troubling and misleading the thinking faculty in its search after the truth.

This, the mind's impotence to compass the infinite space, has been noted and so dealt with by Sir William Hamilton and by Dean Mansel, as to lead them to deny or misinterpret the mind's idea of the infinite, making it but a negation of the finite, and the result of the limitation of the human

intellect, they not perceiving that the finite and infinite are correlatives; that one implies the other; that one is as positive as the other; that they are pure thoughts only, though necessary ones, and apprehended by a mental movement in which Imagination takes no part.

Yet this endeavor to compass the infinite need not be repressed, and has its own high reward. It brings about the emotion of the sublime. Though ending in failure, the mind has been expanded, has attempted a larger life than its customary one, and thus is hinted that we are intended and fitted for a larger life, that our career is to be an endless growth, a projection toward an ever-receding circumference—a life that will grow richer and richer forever and forever as it meets and appropriates the ever-during outgoings from the supernal and inexhaustible fountain.

Imagination may and does rightly deal much with human beings as concretes, with human souls as related to and determined by the physical organization and environment. But it has not restrained itself from attempting to deal with the spiritual *psyche*, with the human soul aloof from its bodily organization. It follows it beyond the article of death, and fills that whole region with delusions.

For our present knowledge, death is the severance of the existing bond connecting the human being with the physical universe, *as we know it*. Though by pure thinking we may find ourselves obliged to acknowledge that we cannot regard the spiritual soul after death as entirely out of relation to the physical universe, as without an environment, without organs or *media* of communication; yet this relation is an abstract one for thought, and cannot be described in the terms of our present knowledge. Hence Imagination is without its proper material, and if it attempts to disport itself here, it can only do so by covertly importing back the body and its physical relations, which, according to our present knowledge, have been abandoned or changed into something which defies conjecture. With what material Imagination may deal legitimately here needs to be carefully defined; and we shall see, later on, that it is not entirely without function.

In these, its vagaries, it dilutes the material which it brings back to suit its purpose. It deals with matter still, but with matter attenuated more and deprived of some of its properties. Thus we have stories of ghosts, of spiritual souls, which can be seen and heard, and either without

gravity, or which might be touched were our senses fine enough. Thus the human soul is still figured as a material entity, located or moving in the absolute space. The world of our knowledge and the body of our mundane consciousness are thus resupplied, and the mind's endeavor to make the proper abstractions and draw the proper inferences is clogged and troubled. We need hardly here refer to the delusions and superstitions which have arisen from this source.

Thus, too, we have Heaven, and Paradise, and Gehenna, figured as having locality in space, fixed or relatively moving; and all the characteristics of our home planet carried into them; all which need not be necessarily harmful, and may have, when regulated, some practical use, but which again troubles our pure thinking, and beclouds the clearness of our doctrines. This has been a perpetual mass of *débris* for theology to clear away in its endeavored advance.

Modern science has been very helpful to theology in removing these delusions. It has taught us that the whole material universe is influx and movement; that no "thing" is at any moment what it was the moment before; that the universe has been, is, and is to be an evolution, moving steadily on to an end, which it is our endeavor to forecast and interpret; that the human body is no fixed aggregation of material particles; that its identity is not material, but ideal, a synthesis of the fixed and the changeable. In this way, through our advancing knowledge of ourselves and the world we live in, have many false notions held in the human mind, and in the Christian mind as well, been dissipated. The doctrine of the resurrection, or physical glorification, has been thus thought out more profoundly and satisfactorily, and all knowledge moved many steps toward harmonization.

All this connected knowledge has weakened greatly the propensity to intolerance which besets the natural man, and out of which Christianity is intended progressively to lead him. We have less than once of superstition, of idolatry, of bigotry and cruelty; though, alas! the tension of the elastic cord by which Christianity draws man away from these, and which is not yet severed, is relaxed, and he subsides back into them too often.

In another respect likewise Imagination has proven to be a dead-weight to thought, and has caused the mind to sink back into the obscure when it was about to mount into the light; has caused it to deny or be

blind, when it was about to welcome the truth. And here, now, I must ask thoughtful attention, for the argument is very subtle.

Science endeavors, by abstraction, to analyze the material universe. It thinks away vitality and chemistry, and tries unsuccessfully to think away mechanical laws, and finding that it cannot do that, simplifies them. In all this process Imagination has been active and useful. It brings us at length from the manifestly heterogeneous to the apparently homogeneous. It gives us the nebular hypothesis, figures an immense aggregation of similar particles, extremely attenuated, removed from all possibility of relation to our present senses, and these in motion—motion according to our idea, however, and whose result is our present universe. If thought abstracts motion from this mass, it is left dead and alien, and these particles are out of all relation, except relative location in space. To make it living and productive motion must be resupplied from the spirit realm, which furnishes the pure energy, the idea, and the final cause. As long, however, as size, shape, and relative location are left to the particles of this attenuated matter, Imagination may still deal with these, though not fruitfully. Philosophic thinking must either assume this *studium* as permanent or eternal, or must account for it. To assume it as permanent or eternal gives us the Platonic Duality, which so lowers our conception of the Divine that the mind refuses to rest in it. Besides, absolute rest is a pure hypothesis, with no philosophic need for it, and no *a posteriori* evidence to support it or even for more than a moment suggest it. Thus Philosophy takes up the problem where Science leaves it, and endeavors to account for the existence of matter, thus reduced by science to its simplest form. But it is evident that at this stage of the mental procedure Imagination is left without a foothold. If size, shape, and relative locality are abstracted, it has no longer any material with which to deal. The philosophic procedure now retires to the contemplation of spirit. It finds there only the immanent relations of the Godhead, required to think personality, thought, and love. What has been called the *actus purus* is only a timeless relation. Activity in the sense of energy producing change is a time conception, and carries us at once beyond the compass of pure spirit. There must be a somewhat upon which it is exercised. *Ex-hypothesi* it is not something alien, limiting the Divine activity; therefore it must be somewhat

etern
The
If
with
int
out
Tha
eter
can
spir
imp
spe
Spi
itse
Div
Phi
the
way
I
fus
ins
tio
thi
tio
Di
ing
ab
mi
th
In
lo
D
m
fe
to
G
it
w
e
o
t
I
v
a
h
t
t

eternal and essential to the constitution of The First Principle itself.

If the attempt is made to think activity within the circle of pure spirit, it evaporates into the conception of relation solely, and out of this no misuse can ever come. That there is a somewhat belonging to the eternal constitution of the Godhead which cannot be spoken of in the terms of pure spirit the Scriptures everywhere assert or imply; and they call it the Divine *Doxa*, speak of it as shared by Father, Son, and Spirit before all creation. Hence creation itself is but the determination of this by the Divine thought and energy. Thus Science, Philosophy, and Revelation, all lead us by their several pathways to this, and in this way find their desired reconciliation.

But now occurs the observation and confusion wrought by Imagination. The mind, instead of resting content with the recognition of this to which it has been led by pure thinking, yields to the impulse of Imagination, and attempts to deal with this abstract Divine Glory, which it can only do by bringing back the very relations which have been abstracted, and dealing with it as if determined. Thus the very Duality which thought had avoided is brought back by Imagination.

When thus presented, Revelation and Philosophy present their objections to this Duality, and rightly; yet the ordinary mind, and even the theological mind, still fettered by the imaginative delusion, comes to deny or fail to apprehend the Divine Glory as anything objective, and degrades it into a mere subjective something, to which no meaning whatever can be attached except by presupposing the possible regard of created intelligence; and thus it is lost to the mind as anything eternal or Divine. It is commonly regarded as the Divine wealth of ideas merely, for which we have another word, the Divine Logos, or the Divine complacency or love, not seeing that this can undergo no suspension or diminution.

Yet the Scriptures interpose many safeguards against this tendency. They nowhere identify the Divine Glory with pure being, or thought, or love. They make it the property of neither Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit, except through mutual possession. They speak of it as something shared by them, as something by virtue of which the universe may become and has become, and which the universe declares and shows forth. They connect it rather with the material than with the spiritual: never speak of it in the terms of spirit, but rather as

that from which the material in its first form came. Its first determination, according to these writings, was the creation of Light, which, to be known as Light by those yet to be, and for whom was the creative fiat, must be contrasted with the obscure. God only lives in the pure Glory. All created intelligence must live in the determined Light, and from this contrast of the clear and the obscure all the boundless richness and the varied beauty of the universe have become.

Thus the interference of Imagination has so presented this doctrine to the mind as to make it objectionable, and has led to the denial or the oblivion of an essential truth. It has brought about this prolonged discord between Revelation, Philosophy, and Science, and hindered the work of unification. That which ought to be, and is, a mere negative attitude of the mind halting, as Imagination, before that to which it has been led by abstraction, yet as the pure thought power availing itself of it to unify its content, is consorted into a positive attitude asserting something, which, if any predications whatever are made concerning it, must be regarded as still material. Thus to the naked idea which thought requires as essential to unification, Imagination has given body and content; has thus hung a weight upon thought, and confused and postponed the attempted classification of Christian doctrine.

Also, in dealing with the Godhead in its immanent relations with it as pure spirit, Imagination has led into incoherent views, not necessarily harmful, but also into errors which are mischievous and have caused many of the strifes and divisions of Christendom.

The declarations of the Christian Scriptures authorize the ascription of personality to what is called the Father, as well as to that which is called the Son and the Holy Spirit; and also the ascription to each of these of essential Divinity. To reconcile these statements is a problem for pure thinking, in which the Christian mind regards itself as having succeeded. But Imagination here likewise interferes, and ascribes to each of these the characteristics of human personality. It figures three several consciousnesses (if this word can be rightly pluralized), each in itself independent, neither necessary to this thought of the other; hence three wills, or possible activities, only arbitrarily in accord, or in accord from the moral necessity of love. Thus we have a virtual Tritheism, with its attendant difficulties. The doubting mind relents

from this, and divisions in Christendom have arisen in consequence. The expressed mind of the Church in its conciliar decisions has guarded against this, but the propensity still persists. No doubt the common Christian mind, ever victimized by Imagination, thinks the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in this Tritheistic way, which may not necessarily be harmful to its devotional or practical life, but also may and has been. No doubt this has helped along the propensity to multiply the objects of worship, and has encouraged the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and other saints. It is then needful that Theology should so rule the public Christian instruction as to obviate this propensity, and render needless the assaults of unbelief or misbelief.

The Christian Scriptures have guarded against this propensity, likewise give no encouragement to it. They furnish material for Imagination in thinking the last manifestation of the Divine in the Incarnate Son; stimulate it in setting forth so clearly and minutely and amply Jesus Christ and His career. Here Imagination cannot be too busy or do too much. But they furnish no suggestion, help, or stimulus to Imagination in dealing with the Father or the Holy Spirit. These only manifest themselves to human apprehension in symbols, in the voice, or the tongues of flame, or otherwise; in symbols variable, and which give no hint whatever of the essential being of what they symbolize, and are only *media* of communication.

Again, at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Imagination is very apt to busy itself in a manner not indicated by the requirements and significance of this ordinance. As when it creates a mental image of Jesus' concrete Divine-human person, and connects it with the transaction then ensuing. This here has no special significance, and is no whit different from what may be done at any other time. It is a mere arbitrary juxtaposition, is not required at the time, and rather diverts the mind from its proper work. Also, when certain views of this sacrament are held, Imagination endeavors to present some indeterminate, vague, and shadowy image of Our Lord's flesh and blood beneath the shews of the bread and the wine, to imagine a miracle, in short, in which attempt failure is inevitable, and the effort has been wasted. This important effort, which is absolutely without result, has even been called an act of faith, and this significant word, with its profound ethical and religious implications, has thus been applied to a

mere mental effort, which, even if it could be successful, could have no reaction upon the character.

As a final illustration, we may note that in dealing with the problems of eschatology the vagaries of Imagination have been markedly mischievous. In dealing with the condition of souls after death, and drawing inferences, the mind, in the imaginative effort, overpasses the bound where pure thought has left the doctrine of the Intermediate State, and carries into it still the universe as determined according to our present knowledge. It carries the material elements, with all their properties (however refined, still material); it carries the human body, with its possible enjoyments and sufferings, into this abstract realm, and gives us purgatorial fires, or some other forms of physical pain or enjoyment. Even in dealing with the resurrected bodies, whether glorified or not, it still regards them as fixed aggregations of matter, and gives them spatial or dynamic determinations similar to our present ones. All which may not be necessarily harmful in the practical life, but which is certainly misleading in the endeavor to express the truth. In dealing with the fate of evil souls it has run riot, and the symbolic language of Holy Scripture, of fire and brimstone and the undying worm, has been taken literally. Thus the language intended to inspire moral dread of sin has been made to produce merely physical shrinking from apprehended pain. Imagination has also given occupations to Satan for which there is no Scriptural warrant, and thus has been thrown into disrepute and met with denial the profound yet difficult doctrine of spiritual evil. Indeed, for Imagination the future life is our present life still, with changes only arbitrarily introduced; while, in truth, the fate of the evil ones is for thought only, and no imaginative presentation is trustworthy.

The endeavor has been made to interpret the Divine Comedia of Dante as symbolical, on the ground that a mind so keen and capacious as his could not be content with views so crass of the future life, if the poem were intended to be literally interpreted. There is probably truth in this, and the poem must not be taken to express Dante's deliberate theologic opinion. But his scientific knowledge was so meagre that it is questionable whether he was able to emancipate himself from the erroneous views of his time, and these must necessarily have affected his philosophic system. It is doubtful, then, whether the poem was intended to symbolize any system of thought or to do

more than illustrate and emphasize certain truths of the Divine moral government.

Milton, too, in dealing with similar object-matter, uses Imagination very freely. His poem would not be interesting had he not done so. But it is questionable whether we are right in inferring his theologic opinion from this—that, for instance, he thought Satan what he here presents him, full of the possibilities of good. He would not have been interesting had he been made purely evil. It is doubtful, too, for the same reason, whether we can rightly infer from the poem alone Milton's alleged Arianism. The conception of the Eternal Son is modified for the needs of the poem, to effect its pictorial power.

Poets, as such, can deal only with the concrete. Verse ceases to be poetry when it deals with the abstract. Therefore poets claim the right to abandon themselves very freely to Imagination, and their philosophic thought cannot be accurately inferred from their poetic works. I have very little confidence in the attempts so often made of late to read into the lines of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, or Goethe a labored and reasoned system of philosophy. The whole naive movement of the poetic mind is diverse from this, and it has to do some violence to itself to throw itself into the philosophic attitude. One power is weakened by the exercise of the other, and poets love their own the best, and cease to be poets when they become philosophers. Some minds, in which both tendencies have been in struggle, might doubtless have accomplished grander work had they yielded themselves entirely to one propensity or the other. Truth cannot be made explicit for thought by imagery, by symbolization. But symbolization may give delight, and strengthen faith by hinting of the noumenon veiled in the beautiful phenomena, and thus carry the mind down into the depths, so as that a unified system comes to be divined rather than thought out, and one, too, in which the concrete still remains in all its warmth. Philosophy proper brings no emotion, while poetry brings it to the full. The one is cold, the other is warm; and this heat sometimes dissolves error, precipitates it, and leaves the purer light. In this work Imagination is the dearest and most satisfying power that the human being possesses.

Let me now speak, and with necessary brevity, yet with reluctance to decline a subject so fascinating, of some of its uses.

Much has been said from time to time of the use of Imagination in scientific investi-

gation, and I remember to have read years ago an article by Professor Tyndall upon this very thesis. I am inclined to think, however, that to maintain this position the word may have been used wrongly or applied too extensively.

In accumulating the facts concerning the material universe which are to be explained, Memory and Imagination have, of course, been busy, and by the latter power are held and retained in their aggregation or apparent integrity. But in the endeavor to discover their fundamental law, or to unify them, a provisional or conjectural theory is supplied by the mind, which may prove inadequate to explain the whole, or may do so partially. This is not drawn directly from the special facts themselves, but is suggested spontaneously, or possibly from a larger induction, whose extent overlaps the present material, yet which does not come at the time into distinct mental vision. An illustration of this is the Atomic theory, which serves provisionally to connect the facts, and enables many useful conclusions to be drawn, making of chemistry a progressive, comparatively clear, and practical science; yet whose failure to account for other facts throws again the theory into suspicion, and forbids mental rest; and thus it is not held as the absolute truth. But indeed the interposition of this or any other theory is not the work of Imagination, which deals only with the actual concrete, or with ideal recombinations of the same. It is rather the work of pure thought, in which the scientific mind becomes philosophic in spite of itself. It is a tentative movement toward the discovery of a First Principle. It is derived rather from the mystical elements of our complex being, springs from its predispositions, and a more or less profound sinking into their depths. It comes up thus from the depths so spontaneously as to seem an intuition or a revelation. But no sooner has this law been supplied by pure thought than Imagination seizes it at once, and busies itself with its application and constructs its universe accordingly. It magnifies the invisible, intangible atoms into something, which the senses, were they sharp enough, might lay hold of, and thus only follows the guidance of pure thought, which again has only followed the innate predispositions implied in the creative idea.

All the concretes in the universe, in their integrity, or their elements, are the proper food for Imagination. It may deal with the material as determined by the spiritual, although with the abstract spir-

itual it can do nothing. The mind only possesses all that comes within the compass of the intuitions of the senses, for all its uses, its truth, and its beauty, by virtue of Imagination. This is the mediating passage-way between these and all human activity. Every human being of necessity uses it, though with greatly variant degrees of power or vividness. Its activity is always emotion, sometimes distressing, but ordinarily delightful. The emotions of Beauty and Sublimity are simply its activity—the soul thus rejoicing in its power to infuse itself into, to live in the life of that which it contemplates—wherein is the coalescence of its own freedom with the Divine liberty. The emotion of the Beautiful is simply the recognition that the movement of the universe is free and not necessitated, except by the self-necessitation of love. In human experience all enthusiasm and its resultant activity come from the unusual power and vividness of this faculty. Thus it enlarges and enriches the whole sphere of life, which, on the other hand, is narrowed and impoverished by its feebleness.

Into the religious life, into the contemplation of Christian truth, its activity may be legitimately carried. Heaven, as a commonwealth of holy souls, of glorified bodies, with a fluent and subservient environment, is a field into which it may safely venture and expatiate. By dwelling upon the rational satisfaction, the supreme beauty of this presentation, it may strengthen the loving and sacrificial disposition and harden the spiritual fibre.

Into Gehenna it is dangerous for it to venture. There are no materials there for it to combine. It is the region of poverty, where there is no beauty nor satisfaction, no variety or expression. Imagination must fail here as it fails to compass the infinitely little in space, which yet the thinking mind cannot deny. And even into Hades imagination must cautiously venture, for, as I have said, it is almost sure to carry this present world with it in such an enterprise, and the result of its contemplation is untrustworthy. But so far as Paradise has any characteristics of the ultimate Heaven, in the loving soul and the expanding intelligence, it may furnish material with which Imagination may profitably deal. Thus those who mourn departed ones are not forbidden to think of them under these limitations, and to think of them as the interceding heart requires.

And especially may Imagination find its dearest and most precious use in recalling for contemplation the image of Jesus

Christ, as displayed in His career, His deeds, and His words. This is our human brother, the tender, sympathetic one, the suffering and yet the majestic one. This is God's manifestation of Himself as loving and benignant, as beneficent yet severe. Imagination can do no better thing than to fasten securely in the mind, to weave this image into the soul's own structure.

They "builded better than they knew," perhaps, these evangelists, who so recorded the events of that wonderful career as to display so clearly that mind and heart, now thought as human, and now again as Divine, but rightly, though mystically, in the union and coalescence of the Divine and human, as to exhibit that character to which human history furnishes nothing like, and with such attractiveness that the deepest abyss of our nature is reached, and we feel ourselves drawn irresistibly by the tender compulsion of love, to meet this Divine-human heart, hardly knowing, when we yield, that we are entering upon a pathway that leads endlessly upward.

In the yielding to this supreme attraction the will represents, not the transient phase of the character, but the original constituents of human nature, the profound predispositions toward the good with which God created us, and which through evil had been turned inward upon themselves, into discord and confusion. Imagination has thus enabled this easy victory of the Divine love. And if those in whom this faculty is less active do still, from moral and mental needs, yield to the truth of Christ, making more of a sacrifice and putting forth more spiritual strength—this shows that the Providence of God and the supplemented activity of the Holy Spirit have recognized these differences in human structure, and proportioned their environment and their influence accordingly. These differences and degrees in imaginative power are dependent probably upon the degrees of fineness in the physical structure, upon brain-conditions merely. When the souls are emancipated from these, and subside into a purer consciousness, such differences will be equalized; and all will be alike in possessing the immediate intuition.

Yet the differences in soul structure, enabling an endless variety and not a monotonous sameness in the company of the holy ones, must be prolonged into the heavenly life itself. How to explain these and exhibit as possible different modes of activity, is a speculative enquiry into which I will not now enter. But to our present thinking Imagination will still be exercised, and

according to subjective needs, in the heavenly state. The spiritual soul will still constantly objectify itself, and infuse itself into that which it contemplates or creates, into the endless concretions of the Divine thought, or its own recombinations of the same, into the spiritual souls which will not forbid, which will freely fuse themselves together.

Thus we see that human Imagination is a reflection of the Divine, inasmuch as it is the ability of the creature to do, under limitations progressively removed, what God does—to live in and enjoy that which it creates. Its activity is one element of the evidence that man is God's image. From the reward of delight which its normal activity brings we infer that the sights and sounds of the material universe which bring this joy are not dead and passive phenomena, are not transitory things, but living and everlasting; that God is in them, and His complacency in them, that they are His free movement and not necessitated from any alien source; that their blossoming into that wonderful characteristic of beauty which we seize and appropriate with such transport is one aspect of the coalescence of God with His human creature; that we, too, shall have unfettered power and unlimited resources, and that for this we were created.

ON THE RECENT CORROBORATIONS OF SCRIPTURE FROM THE REGIONS OF HISTORY AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday School Times*, Philadelphia, September 27, 1890.

PRELIMINARY.

It is to be observed that many of the favorite subjects of scientific or systematic thought in the present day are of a nature powerfully tending to strengthen or assist the arguments available for the proof of religion and for the authority of Scripture. If it had been actually proved, as it is largely argued and seriously held, that the vast and diversified scheme of organic life throughout the world has been evolved from a few simple types, or possibly from one, such a demonstration would both enlarge and confirm the great argument of design. For this argument, instead of being drawn from particular and separate con-

structions, would then be drawn from the entire scheme, and from the relation of all its parts to one another, inasmuch as every earlier portion of it would be an indication, and therefore a prediction, of all those which were to succeed, the seed of a series of coming harvests. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge."*

Again, the formal treatment, in recent years, of the subject of heredity, not only tends to link the generations of mankind in one, but, in proving that our nature undergoes incessant modification through the influence of progenitors, enlarges our conception of the width of its range and the varieties of the forms which it is capable of assuming. It shows us, for example, how the nature as well as the environment of descendants is deteriorated by the fault of ancestors, and how there may have been an education of the race from childhood to maturity, or converse processes of decay. Thus the doctrine of birth-sin, as it is sometimes called, is simply the recognition of the hereditary disorder and degeneracy of our natures; and of all men the evolutionist would be the last to establish a title to object to it in principle.

On these grounds, and on others more specific, which it will be the aim of this paper to set forth in given instances, we should dispel wholly from our minds those spectral notions of antagonism between religion and science which have been raised up by the action of prejudice on the one side, and perhaps of boasting on the other. Of religion and of science, as of man and wife, let us boldly say, "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder." But I proceed to particular illustrations.

I.—AS TO THE CREATION STORY.

A double confirmation has, I conceive, now been supplied to the Creation Story of Genesis; the first by natural, and the second by historic, science.

Perhaps we have been too readily satisfied with assuming, in regard to this narrative, a defensive position; whereas it may be found to contain within its own brief compass, when rightly considered, the guarantee of a Divine communication to man strictly corresponding with what in familiar speech is termed Revelation.

We have here in outline a history of the planet which we inhabit, and of the celestial system to which it belongs. Of the planet, and of the first appearance and early de-

* *Psa. 19: 2.*

velopments of life upon it, anterior to the creation of man, in many of the principal stages which have been ascertained by geology. Of the celestial organization to which our earth belongs, whether in all its vastness or only within the limits of the solar system we can hardly say, but at the least a sketch of the formation of that system from a prior and unadjusted or chaotic state. Upon such a document a sharp issue is at once raised, at least as to the latter or strictly terrestrial part of it, the earth history, for all those who hold it to be in its substance a true account. We accept as demonstrated a series of geological conclusions. We have found the geology of Genesis to stand in such a relation to these conclusions as could not have been exhibited in a record framed by faculties merely human, at any date to which the origin of the Creation Story can now reasonably be referred. Starting from our premise, we have no means of avoiding or holding back from the conclusion that the materials of the story could not have been had without preterhuman aid, and that preterhuman aid is what we term Divine Revelation. And if the time shall ever come when astronomy shall be in a condition to apply to the earlier portion of the chapter the demonstrative methods which geology has found for the latter part, it may happen that we shall owe a debt of the same kind to astronomy as we now owe to geologic science. My present purpose is to call particular attention to the exact nature and extraordinary amount of that debt.

There was nothing necessarily unreasonable in accepting as worthy of belief this portion of the Book of Genesis, along with the rest of the Book, and with other books of Holy Scripture, on general proofs of their inspiration, if sufficient, apart from any independent buttress either of science or of history to the Creation Story. In a court of justice, the evidence of a witness is to be accepted on matters within his cognizance, when his character and intelligence are not questioned; or again, when the main part of a continuous narrative is sufficiently verified, it may be right to accept the rest without separate verification. If a new witness comes into court, and pretends to give us fresh and scientific proof of the Creation Story, this may be true or may be false. If false, the story is not disproved, but stands where it stood before. Bad arguments are often made for a good cause. But if true, the event is one of vast importance.

Now, the present position is as follows: Apart altogether from faith, and from the

general evidences of Revelation, a new witness has come into the court, in the shape of Natural Science. She builds up her system on the observation of facts, and upon inferences from them, which at length attain to a completeness and security such as, if not presenting us with a demonstration in the strictest sense, yet constrain us, as intelligent beings, to belief.

The Creation Story divides itself into the cosmological portion, occupying the first nineteen verses of the chapter, and the geological portion, which is given in the last twelve. The former part has less, and the latter part has more, to do with the direct evidence of fact, and the stringency of the authority which the two may severally claim varies accordingly; but in both the narrative seems to demand, upon the evidence as it stands, rational assent. In regard to both, it is held on the affirmative side that the statements of Genesis have a certain relation to the ascertained facts and the best accepted reasonings; and thus this relation is of such a nature as to require us, in the character of rational investigators, to acknowledge in the written record the presence of elements which must be referred to a superhuman origin. If this be so, then be it observed that natural science is now rendering a new and enormous service to the great cause of belief in the unseen, and is underpinning, so to speak, the structure of that divine revelation which was contained in the Book of Genesis by a new and solid pillar, built up on a foundation of its own from beneath.

It is, then, to be borne in mind, that, as against those who, by arbitrary or irrational interpretation, place Genesis and science at essential variance, our position is not one merely defensive. We are not mere reconcilers, as some call us, searching out expedients to escape a difficulty, to repel an assault. We seek to show, and we may claim to have shown, that the account recorded in the Creation Story for the instruction of all ages has been framed on the principles which, for such an account, reason recommends; and that, interpreted in this view, it is at this juncture like the arrival of a new auxiliary army in the field while the battle is in progress; like the arrival, to choose an historical instance, of the Prussians at Waterloo.

Such is the confirmatory argument founded upon the contents. But now yet another ally has come to join our ranks, under the title of Archæologic and Historic Science. It has deciphered the cuneiform inscriptions, and has read among them a

creation
at Nin
the vo
partly
corres
with
plain
firma
with
ticult
mony
acter
lays
thor
of c
conco
T

by M
erici
It r
but
rece
the
ver
sen
the
fiel
of
life
an
cit
go
em
in
m
us
st
ra
p

c
t
i
v
c

creation story inscribed on the tablets found at Nineveh. Here we have a new witness to the very early existence, among civilized or partly civilized men, of records of creation corresponding in very essential particulars with the Hebrew narrative. Such a witness plainly, to some extent, offers to it confirmation; but also stands in competition with it. The competition is in those particulars where the accounts are not in harmony. As to these, standing on the character of its contents, the Hebrew tradition lays claim to superior antiquity and authority. But in proving the vast antiquity of certain fundamental ideas, the two are concurrent, and not competitive.

The Babylonian Creation Story is given by Mr. Smith in his "Assyrian Discoveries,"* so far as its mutilated state permits. It runs as follows, and we cannot, I think, but cherish the hope that it may hereafter receive extension or elucidation: "When the gods in their assembly made the universe, there was confusion, and the gods sent out the spirit of life. They then create the beast of the field, the animal of the field, and the reptile or the creeping thing of the field, and fix in them the spirit of life. Next comes the creation of domestic animals, and the creeping things of the city." Here we have, 1, creation by the gods; 2, chaos; 3, life, and only by inference, order; 4, wide extension of this life in beasts and reptiles; 5, after this the domesticated animals. Thus there is before us a real, though rude and imperfect, structural resemblance to the Hebrew narrative, together with the interpolation of polytheism.

From the works of Schrader† on the cuneiform inscriptions, some further particulars may be gathered. He observes that in Berosus, as in Genesis, we begin with water and darkness. On which I would only observe that Berosus, who wrote in Greek, may not improbably have known the Mosaic writings,‡ and that water, in the text of Genesis, may be equivalent to fluid. The marked points of correspondence appear to be these: that the heavenly bodies are created after the heavens, which, I presume, may be meant to include the light. That the land population follows that of the water, and appears when vegetation has already begun. That the monuments name a Babylonian week, with the seventh day as a day of consecration, called also an evil

day,* perhaps because evil for any work done on it. The inscription says,

"To redeem them, created mankind

The merciful one, in whom is the power that summons to life,"

which is faintly comparable with the words of Genesis 2:7, and the Jehovistic account, "and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." What seems to disappear from the Babylonian account is that evident intention of series and orderly development, or evolution, which is so wonderful a feature in the Mosaic narrative.

Dawson, in a recent work, observes that the polytheistic element is the distinctive feature of the Chaldean record, and that the originals of the tablets from Nineveh may have been very ancient, but that they are so mixed up with the history of a Chaldean hero, named Izdubar, as to suggest that there may have existed before it still older creation legends. He compares this record with the corresponding account in Genesis, which is as broadly marked with the idea of the Divine unity as the Chaldean legend is pervaded by the conception of polytheism. And he adds, "Is it not likely that the simpler belief is older than the more complex; that which required no priests, ritual, or temple, older than that with which all these things were necessarily associated?" He naturally assigns a marked superiority to the "Hebrew Genesis."† In truth, that superiority seems to be not great only, but immeasurable. In one point only do the tablets go beyond the narrative of Genesis; they record the great struggle with rebellion, the war in heaven between Merodach and Tiamat. But, upon the whole, our Bible narrative is a regular structure; it is orderly, progressive, and rational; that of the tablets is dark and confused. This may, however, be referable in part to the imperfection of the tablets, the third of which, Mr. Sayce thinks, may probably have recounted the formation of the earth.‡ The one is charged in a marvellous way with instruction and moral purpose; from the other they have almost disappeared. The first has, as we believe, been receiving marked confirmation in the most vital particulars from cosmic and geologic science; on the second, they can hardly be said to cast more than the faintest light. And yet this inferior document is itself of very great confirmatory value; for the Izdubar legends, says Mr. Smith,§ ap-

* Page 397.

† Schrader, "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament." Translated by Whitehouse. Vol. I., pp. 4, *seqq.*

‡ Smith, *Biog. Dict.*

* Schrader, I. 19.

† "Modern Science in Bible Lands," p. 32.

‡ "Hibbert Lectures," p. 394.

§ "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 103.

pear to have been composed more than 2000 years B.C. There is no late date to which the Mosaic narrative can with a shadow of probability be referred. It could not have been formed without a miracle from the tablets as they stand. The two are evidently accounts proceeding from a common source, but derived through independent channels. The one comes through a powerful and civilized empire, the other through an obscure nomad family. In the relative superiority of the Mosaic narrative all the rules of merely human likelihoods are reversed, and the presumption of a Divine illumination is proportionably augmented. But the unsuspected antiquity of the inferior legend attests by an independent witness, if not the truth, yet at least the presumable origin, of its transcendent rival.

So far as scientific opinion is concerned, another remarkable confirmation seems to have been given to the cosmical portion of the Creation Story in Genesis by the course which it has taken of late years. Writing in 1839, Dr. Whewell devoted a chapter of his "*Bridgewater Treatises on Astronomy and Physics*"* to the Nebular, or, as it is often called, Rotatory hypothesis. He described it in outline, as it had been conceived by La Place. The idea of it was that the mass which eventually centred in the sun, revolved in a state of excessive heat; that, as it gradually cooled, the rapidity of its motion was increased; that, as the centrifugal force thus grew, the mass detached from itself exterior zones or rings of gas or vapor, which most commonly broke up into several minor masses, and so gradually formed the planetary system. Dr. Whewell's object in this early notice of a subject, which has since attracted, I believe, very general attention in the world of astronomical science, was to sustain and illustrate his general argument, by showing how this theory did nothing whatever to explain the origin of the system, or to weaken the statement of Newton, that its admirable arrangement must be "the work of an intelligent and most powerful being." The origin of this rotation, said Dr. Whewell, remains unexplained, and still as powerfully as ever cries aloud for, and proclaims, an Author. My purpose in here naming the subject is to point out that Dr. Whewell then found himself dealing with a theory which had not yet obtained any wide currency or authority, and he then "left to other persons and to future ages to decide

upon the merits of the nebular hypothesis."* But, during the half century which has elapsed since he produced his Treatise, this hypothesis is understood to have gained very general acceptance from astronomers. I refer to this result of the most modern studies as a new and remarkable establishment of accord between natural science on the one hand (so far as its reasonings have proceeded) and the Book of Genesis on the other. Often has it been endeavored to place the Mosaic geology in conflict with ascertained results, but comparatively little of the same kind has been attempted, so far as I know, by persons of scientific authority, with regard to the cosmogony which occupies the earlier portion of the chapter. On the other hand, it has been shown, with what seems to me conclusive clearness, that, without the use of scientific language, that very process has been described in slight outline, but in singular correspondence with the hypothesis now so largely accepted. That hypothesis may not indeed have reached the point of demonstration, and this the subject-matter itself may be found not to permit; yet it has attained to so much of authority from consent that Dr. Whewell, were he writing now, would not have had simply to hand it over to the future for consideration, but would more probably have declared that it holds the field, and seems little likely to be displaced from it.

With the creation of the world or the solar system, the question of its termination is naturally associated. On this subject, however, I will not dwell at length, because the support here afforded by scientific opinion is given to the Scriptures of the New Testament rather than the Old. To refer again to Dr. Whewell. In a passage of extraordinary grandeur, he delivered (I think in a sermon) his opinion that the world would end with a catastrophe, instead of dying what is termed a natural death. Such, as we know, is the emphatic declaration of the inspired Word: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; and the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up."† And again, "Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." These were the words of Dr. Whewell nearly half a century

* Chap. VII., p. 181.

* Page 190.

† 2 Peter 3: 10, 12.

ago. They were delivered rather as by one uttering his own firm opinion, than as expressing the conviction of astronomers at large. Nevertheless, as I have been informed on high authority, it is now the established conclusion of astronomers, reasoning from ascertained facts, that the Galilean fishermen knew what all the genius and learning of the world for thousands of years failed to discover, and that

"The great globe itself,
Yea all, which it inherit, shall dissolve."*

II.—AS TO THE FLOOD STORY.

I pass now to the Flood-Legend, one form of which has come down through Berosus and Josephus, but which acquires much more certain antiquity, and greater grandeur, from the inscriptions. Their account, says Schrader, whose bias cannot, I think, be considered as friendly toward the Hebrew record, "brings the biblical narrative into much closer relation with the Chaldean flood-legend than could be assumed on the basis of the tradition in Berosus."† It forms part of the Izdubar legends discovered by Mr. George Smith, who published his account of them in 1872, and who assigns to them a date anterior to 2000 years B.C. under the early Babylonian empire.‡ The hero of the legends is believed by Mr. Smith to be the same as the Nimrod of Genesis. Like the Creation Story of Genesis, that of the Flood derives corroboration from the Babylonian record, inasmuch as it is thus carried back by an independent testimony to a very great antiquity. That record, composed, as Mr. Smith thinks, not long after the time of Izdubar or Nimrod, gives us the tradition of a flood which was a divine punishment for the wickedness of the world, and of a holy man who built an ark and escaped the destruction.§ The particulars are set out in this volume. They differ in many respects from those of Genesis; but the essential features are in the highest degree marked, and, together with certain of the details, are singularly accordant.|| As in the case of the Creation Story, so here there is stamped upon them the note of a common source, and of channels of descent separated at some later date. In this case, however, the Babylonian narrative holds a higher position relatively to the scriptural record than in the case of the Creation.

The hero of the deluge is Hasisadra—a

name which has been Hellenized into Xisuthrus—who, on the eleventh tablet, relates to Izdubar (the supposed Nimrod) the story of the deluge. I shall only attempt an outline presenting the main points.*

In the ancient city of Surippah, where Anu and other great gods were worshipped, Hasisadra was divinely warned by Hea, the great water-god, to construct a ship, of which the size is named, and commit to it "the seed of life, all of it," as "the sinner and life" were about to be destroyed by a flood. Food, furniture, wealth, servants, and animals were all to be embarked. The building and loading of the ship are then described, and the part taken by the several gods in bringing about the catastrophe. But "the gods" themselves feared the tempest, and "ascended to the heaven of Anu." This deluge lasted for six days: on the seventh all was quiet. There is sight of land from within the vessel. It is arrested by the mountain of Nizir. A dove is sent forth, and returns. A swallow is sent, and does the like. A raven goes, feeds on the corpses that are afloat, and returns not. Then comes landing, sacrifice, the sending forth of animals. Ninip and Hea then remonstrate with Bel, and suggest other more usual means of chastizing men, in which there seems to be some affinity to the promise of Genesis 8:21, 22, and 9:11-17, that there should never again be a flood upon the earth. And "then dwelt Hasisadra in a remote place at the mouth of the rivers."†

The resemblances between this narrative of the flood and that in Genesis are such as clearly to betoken a relationship at or near the source. The most peculiar, and at the same time purely incidental, among all the details of the narrative, appears to be the threefold experiment with birds upon the decline of the waters; but this appears alike in the three narratives of Chaldaea, the Bible, and Berosus. No other nations have accounts so full and precise as these.‡

Mr. Smith has some judicious and impartial observations on the two accounts.§ The Chaldean account indicates the nature of the country in which the flood took place. Surippah is near the mouth of the Euphrates, and there Hea was worshipped as the God of the deluge. The Hebrew account has no local confirmations of the story. When Surippah was conquered, in the sixteenth century B.C., or earlier, it is called in the record "the city of the ark." Hasisadra is, like Noah, a devout man; and

* Shakespeare, "Tempest," IV. 1. § *Ibid.*, and p. 204.
† Schrader, l. 47. † Pages 205, 206, *seqq.*
‡ "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 166.

* "Assyrian Discoveries," page 184, *seqq.*
† Smith, pp. 184-194. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

§ *Ibid.*

the Chaldean deluge is, like the Hebrew, a punishment for gross and widespread sin. Schrader argued to attenuate this statement, but, as it appears to me, in the spirit of a partisan, rather than a judge.* The dimensions of the ark vary in the three accounts; and on the variations of numerals I observe elsewhere. It may, however, be observed, that the Babylonian account, which presumably was written down from a very early date, and in a durable form, has in this respect a great advantage over oral transmission, which is most of all dangerous for numerical statements. The inscription describes a regular vessel with boatmen, another incident of local color. The accounts curiously coincide in the minute point that, both inside and out, the ark is coated with bitumen. The tablet tells us that not eight only, but a comparatively large number of persons went on board. The Bible gives forty days as the duration of the flood, meaning apparently at the height. After a hundred and fifty days the water all abated. The whole duration before disappearance is a year and ten days.† The tablet allows only seven days for the fulness of the flood. On the seventh day all storm has ceased. Hasisadra then sends out the bird. The ship is stranded for seven days more on the mountains of Nizir, so that the total term mentioned is one of only fourteen days. Nizir lies away to the east, far from the site of Ararat mentioned in Genesis; on the other hand,‡ the present tradition of the country lands the ark at a site farther to the north, and nearer Ararat. Again as to the birds. In Genesis, Noah sends out a raven, which does not return; then a dove three times at intervals of seven days; on the third occasion, the dove does not return. The inscription sends, first, a dove, which returns, then a swallow, which returns, and then a raven, which does not return. Lastly, in the Bible, Noah lives after the flood for 350 years; the tablet and Berosus both assign to him, together, rather strangely, with his daughter and the helmsman,§ that translation to heaven for his piety which Genesis gives to Enoch. Before translation, he was visited by Izdubar, and the region was deemed a sacred region.

On a general comparison of these two profoundly interesting records, the result appears to be that in what is circumstantial only there is much difference along with some curious resemblance; but in the outline of the fundamental facts, and in the

moral considerations applicable, they are completely at one. The wickedness of the antediluvian world, the Divine anger, the command to build, the use of this vehicle of escape, and the erection of an altar of thanksgiving, are recorded alike in both. We have no right to assume that either of the accounts, as it stands, is contemporary with the period of the flood. The point in which the Bible account is inferior, is the absence of local coloring. Yet this, so far from impairing its claim to our acceptance, appears, on the contrary, to accredit it, because it is a feature which, given the circumstances of the case, there was reason to expect. If, indeed, we ride the hobby of the negative criticism, the Bible account bristles everywhere with difficulty. It is inconceivable that the framers should have in that case departed so widely from the inscription in points so palpable to all the world, or should have let slip the local color with which a fabricator or late relator would have been forward to dress up his narrative. But if we take Abraham, with his ancestors and his posterity, as a nomad people, religious and of simple life, such as the Bible represents them, at an earlier period hanging on the outskirts of the Babylonian power, at a later one migratory toward the West, it was natural for them to drop the local coloring of a region with which all their relations had come to an end; and this has been done, not in the case of the flood only, but throughout the Abrahamic narrative down to the entry into the promised land.

The most significant difference of all between the two records is that the inscription is based upon polytheism, while in the Bible, here as elsewhere, all is based upon the doctrine of one God. That is to say, the simpler form is the basis of the Bible narrative, and the simpler form, according to the generally recognized principle, is that nearest the source, most closely akin to the occurrence or the original record. The religion of Noah agrees with that of the common father, Adam; the religion of Hasisadra has departed from the primitive belief, and exhibits to us those multiplied and deteriorated images of the deity which human infirmity and sin had introduced.

While Schrader glances at the period when the Babylonian flood-legend reached the Hebrews as that of "the prophetic narrator of early biblical history," he candidly adds, "I am led to the obvious conclusion that the Hebrews were acquainted with this legend at a much earlier period, and that it is far from impossible that they

* Vol. I., p. 49.
† Gen. 7: 11-14, 17, 24.

‡ Smith, p. 217.
§ Schrader, I. 60.

acquired a knowledge of these and the other primitive myths now under investigation as far back as in the time of their earlier settlements in Babylonia, and that they carried these stories with them from Ur of the Chaldees." For him they are all myths; the original invention is in Babylonia, and the Hebrews are early copyists. For others, however, they are histories; and the twin versions bear testimony by their concurrence, and even in some respects by their discrepancies, to their historical character. If there was remoulding, it may be the more detailed and circumstantial narration which is presumptively entitled to the credit of it; and the Bible story, more sparing in its details, but far broader and more direct in the terrible lesson it conveys, may reasonably be judged to have come down from the source with the smallest amount of variation from the original.

It may be noticed that the translation to heaven of Hasisadra, the Noah of the tablets, is in curious accordance with that far larger development both of the under-world and of the future state, which marks alike the Babylonian and the Egyptian systems in comparison with that of the Old Testament, and forms an interesting but separate subject of discussion.

The Hebrew story of the Deluge has long been supported by a diversity of traditions among nations and races of the world, but never before with such particularity, or such corroboration in the sense and to the extent before described. But though we have now a new and important witness in court on our behalf, yet undoubtedly, if the narrative be provably untrue, the testimony of both, or of any number of traditional witnesses, must fall to the ground.

The voice of natural science has not been, and probably is not at present, uniform on this subject. The negative has just been presented to the world, of course with great ability, and also in a sufficiently magisterial form, by Professor Huxley. He conceives that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures;* and, as these are not trustworthy, the consequence is that it must not stand but fall. With this proposition I have here nothing to do.

Mr. Huxley selects the flood-story for the capital article of his indictment. But he treats it as little worthy of serious notice. "It is difficult to persuade serious scientific enquirers to occupy themselves in any way with the Noachian deluge."[†] He finds,

indeed, a sort of historic nucleus for a partial deluge in the occasional desolating floods of the Euphrates and Tigris.* But be it partial or be it general, he applies the same contemptuous negative doctrine to the deluge: perhaps most of all to a particularly absurd attempt at reconciliation, which places it "at the end of the glacial epoch!"[†] I am far from intending to enter in a controversy, which I have no capacity to handle. Yet I may be bold enough to mention, that, while Mr. Huxley is speaking in the name of science at large, some votaries of science hold an entirely different language. Moreover, that the idea of a flood was not thus summarily dismissed by the luminaries of the scientific world anterior to the present day; and that the grounds of this dismissal are not of recent discovery, but were fully open to the geologists of the last generation. Quite recently the doctrine of a deluge has been maintained by Sir J. Dawson,[‡] by Mr. Howorth, and by the Duke of Argyll (if I interpret him aright).§ all of whom are surely to be considered as "serious scientific enquirers."

Mr. Howorth, in his learned and laborious work on "The Mammoth and the Flood," is not bound by any superstitious reverence for the mere text of the Book of Genesis; for, in his preface,|| he casts aside as null its traditions respecting all that preceded the creation of man. He collects largely not only the diluvial traditions of so many races and countries, but an immense mass of paleontological evidence; and, having laid this wide ground for his induction, he declares that, in his judgment, the whole points unmistakably "to a widespread calamity, involving a flood on a great scale. I do not see how the historian, the archaeologist, and the paleontologist can avoid making this conclusion in future a prime factor in their discussions, and I venture to think that before long it will be accepted as unanswerable."[¶]

Moreover, I am free to consider history no less a science, though a less determinate science, than geology or biology; and I quote in conclusion the following passage from Lenormant, which follows a copious collection of testimonies to the erudition of a deluge in almost all lands:

"La longue revue, à laquelle nous venons de nous livrer, nous permet d'affirmer que le récit du déluge est une tradition universelle dans tous les rameaux de l'human-

* *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1890, p. 8. † Page 12.

* *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1890, p. 14. † Page 13.
 ‡ "Modern Science in Bible Lands," p. 232.
 § In the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, April, 1890.
 ¶ Page 15., x. ¶ Page 463.

ité, à l'exception toutefois de la race noire. Mais un souvenir partout, aussi précis et aussi concordant, ne saurait être celui d'un mythe inventé à plaisir : aucun rÿthe religieux ou cosmogonique ne présente ce caractère d'universalité. C'est nécessairement le souvenir d'un événement réel et terrible, qui frappa assez puissamment l'imagination des ancêtres de notre espèce pour n'être jamais oublié de leurs descendants. Ce cataclysme se produisit près du berceau primitif de l'humanité."*

III.—AS TO THE GREAT DISPERSION.

The contents of the tenth chapter of Genesis constitute a document of a character altogether extraordinary ; for example, in the two following particulars. First, it is without parallel in the world. Nowhere else is there known to us a distinct and detailed endeavor to draw downward from a single source the multiplication of men in the earth by families, and the distribution of them over the face of the earth. Secondly, this account, containing seventy-two names of men (to which more are added in connection with the descent of Abram when we reach chap. 12), is so particular, that any notion of its transmission by ordinary means may appear to present much difficulty. Abram, when he migrated westward, came from a country which we now know to have possessed in his time means of durable record ; but, as the head of a nomad family, he could hardly have carried with him written traditions : and a specific narrative of this kind, like the Greek Catalogue in the "Iliad," presented great difficulties in the way of oral transmission through several, perhaps many, generations, until the time when we may reasonably suppose the children of Israel to have acquired the art of writing during their sojourn in Egypt. The assisting Providence of God may suggest itself to the believing mind as having supplied the needful measure of that aid, which Homer† besought, in a kindred case, from the Muses. But the document, if thus considered, lays a certain weight upon our faculty of belief, and even offers a tempting invitation to assault from those

who are adversely minded. This weight, however, is converted at once into a prop, into a buttress which well and stoutly supports the wall, when we find that this singular and, so to speak, exposed tradition has received in the most fundamental and vital points, from the researches of philological and of historical science, striking and, we may suppose, conclusive confirmation.

The foundation of the arrangement is the threefold division of the human race from a certain period of its history. If such a division actually took place, we might expect to find the traces of it in a threefold division of language, which has an unquestionable relation to race ; and, conversely, such a divarication in language proves an early distribution of races or families, from which it took its origin. Without entering into details, it may be observed that the Book of Genesis associates the distinctions of language with the local dispersion of man ; and it is now known that, in days antecedent to the permanent bond of literature, such an association is agreeable not only to probability, but to the ascertained laws of experience. And now we find that comparative philology, dealing at large with the languages of the world, has resolved them into that very threefold division, which the distribution of man according to Genesis 10, into three great branches, anticipates and requires. Here is again an important service rendered by modern science to belief.

It is true that the Bible (Gen. 11 : 1) speaks of language as originally one, and that this proposition has not yet been generally affirmed by philology. Yet the way to it has been opened, and it need excite no surprise should the goal be soon attained. Professor Max Müller, I believe, says there is no proof that the Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian families of language had independent beginnings ; that radicals existing in all the three can be traced to the common source, and that even the grammars may have been originally one. But this subject still awaits its scientific decision.

The Table of Peoples presents on its surface some apparent anomalies ; of which, however, a rational account can be given, and one which for the most part converts them into evidences in its favor. For instance, the Hamitic portion presents to us out of a total of thirty names no less than eighteen which are plural words, and which are therefore national or tribal, while only two of the same class are found in the rest of the account. But this seems upon consideration to illustrate what we know from

* "Les Origines de l'Histoire," pp. 489, 490. Second Edition, 1880. "The long review to which we have just applied ourselves warrants our affirming that the tale of the Deluge is an universal tradition among all the branches of the human family, excepting, however, the blacks. But a remembrance prevailing everywhere, so precise and so concordant, cannot be that of a myth arbitrarily invented. No religious or cosmogonic myth presents such a character of universality. It must of necessity be a recollection of a great and terrible occurrence, which impressed the imagination of the ancestors of our race so powerfully as never to have been forgotten by their descendants. That cataclysm took place at a spot near the primal cradle of humanity."

† Il., II. 484.

history; namely, that the Hamitic races exhibited the most precocious development, and set up the earliest known civilizations of the world, those of Babylonia and of Egypt.

Again, the Cushite stock, after its regular order is arrested in verse 7 of the chapter, jumps, as it were, down to Nimrod in verses 8-10. But he is the only person in the Table who is described as founding a kingdom, and his position has a great resemblance to that of Izdubar in the Assyrian Tablets, with whom he is identified by Mr. George Smith.

Again, as Shem, Ham, and Japheth are four times mentioned together, and invariably in this order, it seems to follow naturally that this is the order of their ages. In chapter 10, however, their descendants are set out in the inverse order, and Japheth takes precedence. But this also, upon reflection, may seem to be quite natural. Migration was largely connected with considerations of space and food. It may be that the younger had to give place to the elder, and that the children of Japheth had on this account to be the first in moving from the common center.

Further, in the Japhetic line the genealogy wholly stops with the next generation but one, whereas it is continued farther, not only in the Semitic line, which had to be connected with Abram, but also in the Hamitic, by the mention of Nimrod and of the Philistines. This, however, seems perfectly natural if the line of Japheth, as is probable, moved the first, and, as is manifest, went the farthest so as to be out of sight of the narrator, while the descendants of Shem and Ham remained locally in contact with each other. Knobel* has observed that in each of the three branches the enumeration begins with those who traveled to the greatest distance from the common center (which is taken by him to be near Mount Ararat), and accordingly the Japhetites are reckoned from the northwest, the Semites from the southeast, and Hamites from the southwest. Just as, in the case of the Homeric Catalogue,† this methodical arrangement probably gave great assistance to the memory of the first recorder.

Knobel has discussed with great minuteness and care the particular names of the recital, and he traces them to their historic seats; as has Bishop Browne, in the "Speaker's Commentary." Some examples may be given. The Japhetites are those (Japhah) of fair complexion. They take to

the isles or coast-lands,* the seaward countries of the north and west. Here we meet them in the Cimmerians and Cimbri. Ashkenaz, the son of Gomer, is found in Scandinavia,† the Scangia of Jornandus, the chief seat of the German stock. Another route is marked in the same direction by Ascania,‡ in Asia Minor, a name found at various points of that region. Knobel thinks§ there is a trace of the Teutonic race in Teuthras, a name found on both sides in the war of the Iliad.|| He proceeds with the list of Japhetites as follows. Riphath, he thinks, is traced in the Carpathian country, Togarma in Armenia, Magog in the Slavs, Madai in the Medes, Javan in the Iacones or Ionians, Elisa in Æolians, Tarshish in the Tursenoi, Kittim in the Chitians of Cyprus, Dodanim in the Dardanians, Tubal in the Iberians, Meshech in the Meschi or Moschl, Tiras in the Thracians (Thrax or Thras).¶ Some among these particular interpretations—for instance, that given to Elisa—may be untenable. Bishop Browne** sets out the various opinions that have been held, mostly without declaring a preference. It is not, however, the accuracy of each particular identification, nor even of every particular item of the text, but the principles of the general arrangement, and the large number of cases reasonably clear, which give the subject its importance.

The Semitic and Hamitic branches offer less difficulty to the investigator. No part is more satisfactory than that which relates to the nations of Palestine, and to the names of Canaan, Sidon, and Heth, where every particular known to us from independent history or tradition, supports, so far as I can judge, in a most remarkable manner, the trustworthiness of the record. Speaking generally, perhaps no one can go farther than Knobel in the work of identification. His treatise is of considerable authority, and is of the greater value because he does not belong to the school of conservative criticism.

IV.—AS TO THE SINAITIC JOURNEY.

In his "Modern Science in Bible Lands," Sir J. Dawson has examined, with elaborate care, first the dwelling-place of the Israelites in Egypt, and their probable route from it until they cross the Yam Suph; and then, still more particularly, the account of

* See Revised Version, Gen. 10: 5.

† Knobel, *Völkertafel d. r. Genesis*, pp. 35, 37.

‡ Page 39.

§ Page 44.

¶ Pages 53, 60, 71, 77, 81, 95, 117, 123.

** "Speaker's Commentary," *Genesis in loc.*

* *Völkertafel der Genesis*, p. 14. Giessen, 1850.

† *Juventus Mundi*, p. 467.

their journeyings beyond the Red Sea. Thus he thinks that they had crossed at a point,* now forming part of the Bitter Lakes of the isthmus, but then a part of the Red Sea itself, which was fed in ancient times by a branch of the Nile flowing eastward.† Yam Suph, or sea of weeds, is the name given to it in the Bible.‡

Beyond the Red Sea, and onward to the Sinaitic region, the country has been surveyed by officers of the British Ordnance. All the instruments of modern science have been employed; the results have been published on a large scale; and the effect, as reported by Sir J. Dawson, has been "entire agreement of the members of the party on essential points;§ and the ascertainment of such complete coincidence of the actual features of the country with the requirements of the Mosaic narrative, as to prove it to be a contemporary record of the events to which it relates.||

The route pursued down the coast of the Red Sea, and then to the eastward, was peculiar, as it seems to have been dictated by a combination of strategical considerations with those which concerned the subsistence of the people, and especially the supply of water. The local indications are on this account all the more remarkable. It is not possible, without exceeding the limits proper for the present observations, to convey the full force of the evidence which shows how the stamp of Egypt was impressed both upon the Israelites themselves and upon the narrative, in Exodus, of their escape, inasmuch as it depends on the details of measurement, atmosphere, water supply, and other physical circumstances, and their relation to the Mosaic narrative. The conclusions reached have no direct bearing upon the proofs of a Divine revelation through the Scriptures, but they are of great historical importance in establishing the credit of the Book, and its contemporaneous character as to the substance of its contents.

LONDON, ENG.

H. P. LIDDON.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY REV. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, CANON
OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), October, 1890.

NOT for a moment will I pretend that I write these memorial words on Henry Parry

Liddon in the spirit of an impartial critic. On the contrary, I venture to write them only in order that those thousands who admired and honored him in his public career may know a little more of what it was which those who had the privilege of his intimacy, and who dearly loved him, felt to be the peculiar value and significance of his personality. Writing of him under the very shadow of his loss, that significance and that value impress themselves with special acuteness; and the memory is quickened by an affection which can with difficulty learn to believe that a presence so vital and so exhilarating will never be found at our side again, with the look and the speech that had, for so long, been our delight.

What is it that we should say of him, if we are asked why we attributed to him such peculiar value?

I need not touch on all those obvious gifts of his, which were revealed through his preaching and his writing, and which are public property. He had literary and theological learning; he had style; he had rhetorical skill and passion. All this I can assume to be acknowledged; but what was it in him which gave force and color to all this?

Well, he had that which we call "distinction." You might agree with him, or not agree; you might criticise and discuss his gifts; but, anyhow, he had the quality of speciality. In any roomful of men, his presence was felt with a distinct and rare impression. If he let himself speak, his voice, manner, style, articulation, arrested you; you wanted to listen to him, whoever else was speaking: his phrases, his expressions, caught your ear. Here was somebody notable; so you knew. He stood out from his fellows: there was a flavor in his company which was unique.

And this impression was one which belonged to character; it was not the result of any particular and separate gift, but it made itself known through them all. Whatever he did or said was unlike another's; was characteristic of himself. And this was what gave him, to those who had the joy of his friendship, such intense and unfailing interest. In days such as ours, where the average standard of culture, and cleverness, and character is so high, it requires a most remarkable force of inward energy for any one to show himself clearly and distinctly above the average. It is this which makes the present generation of educated men appear so strangely dull and commonplace. Such crowds of men can come up to a very decent level; so very, very few can pass it.

* Page 380.

§ Pages 371, 406.

† Page 392.

‡ Page 404.

|| Page 407.

The result is that they all look exactly alike ; they all talk with about the same ability ; they all conform to a very respectable standard of knowledge and reading and wits ; we feel that they have all been through a common mill ; a very *good* mill ; we do not deny that ; only, good as are Huntley & Palmer's Reading Mills, it must be confessed that the biscuits are very much alike. This feeling of the common average weighs upon us, and depresses. It makes us horribly conscious that nobody need be missed—that there is certain to be only too many who are ready to take his place, and who will do as well as he. And, therefore, it is with quite a peculiar and excessive delight that we recognize one who, like Liddon, so obviously stands apart from, and above, the average. He had kept his contours free ; he had never let himself be ground down to the ordinary mould. He had got the tone and quality that could never be mistaken for another's. He was, in a word, intensely interesting. To watch him, to catch his glance, his gestures, his motion, his intonation, was a perpetual joy in itself. Everything that came from him, in word or deed, was exactly typical of him. It was so sure to be like him, that it gave you the shock of a delicious surprise, every time it happened—the surprise, not of a novelty, but of recognizing so intense an identity under a novel form. You seized on it with the laughing glee of a scientific enthusiast pouncing on a new specimen, in some unexpected spot, of a favorite or familiar organism. You mentally treasured up the saying, or the act, whatever it was ; you went about repeating or re-enacting it ; you laughed quietly to yourself alone as you recalled it. This gave to his companionship an inexhaustible charm ; it was impossible ever to be with him beyond a few minutes without adding to your stores of refreshing memories of this kind. Up something was sure to come : and it bubbled up so instinctively ; and it threw itself into such varied and unexpected forms ; and if once a vein was started, it developed so freely and so richly ; and the happy words flowed along with such amazing rapidity of selection ; and he became so confident and insistent and abundant, as he felt the reflex of your enjoyment in it ; and his eye so kindled with merriment and keenness and animation, and his face so twinkled with expressive motions and brimming fancies ; that, when at last you managed to drag yourself out of his affectionate grasp, as he followed you out of his room to the top of the stairs, and still held both your hands in his, and still had some last irrepressible epithet or inimitable

phrase to add to the many already showered upon you ; you disappeared glowing with the sense that, certainly, there was no talk like Liddon's—no one quite so special and so vitalizing.

Of course, for this to happen he required to know you, to know exactly where he stood toward you ; no one was more sensitive to the social atmosphere about him. He could never expand like this except when he was sure of the surroundings. Until he had made himself aware of his company, he would repress every signal or suggestion of all this. People might interview him or meet him and never suspect the fund of imaginative and ironical humor that he was holding in restraint. But once give him confidence in you, and so long as he was in decent health, these funds never failed you. The humor was instinctive and overflowing. Not even dark hours of anxiety would be enough to subdue it. Even at times when he was writing letters full of the blackest forebodings, and when he was penetrated with pessimistic distresses, still, in the evening, when you caught him free to talk, the delicious springs of fun and brilliancy would bubble and brim with the same inevitable felicity. Mr. Frederic Harrison, in his touching little picture of him, harps on his sweet and gentle melancholy. This conveys a very partial impression. I should say that, gentle as was his manner, with its soft tenderness of courtesy, and its priestly touch of anxiety, still there was no one on earth whose eye was so sure to greet one with a beaming look of alertness, or who was so quick in response to any fun. Nor, again, should I say that his habitual gentleness could at all conceal the fire that glowed beneath it, and which would kindle into ready flame at any provocation that was aware how to rouse it. There were subjects on which he would speak with a vehement excitement that grew hotter as it found words ; and he had this mark of the natural orator, that the language would win epigrammatic force and precision, according to the measure of the heat that burned behind it ; and again the brilliancy of the epigrams that flowed from his lips would feed and renew the heat. At such times it was evident how explosive were the forces of that sensitive physique, which he had to manage and control under the restraint of a delicate and disciplined courtesy.

Such a personality, so fresh, so vivid, so abundant, so elastic, so vivacious, was bound to be ever interesting and ever charming. Nor was this freshness, this elasticity of character, the least diminished by the fact

that, intellectually, his lines were singularly formal and motionless. On the contrary, is it not often true that humor and imagination play with fullest freedom round and about an intellectual pivot which is absolutely fixed? The very fixity of the convictions sets these forces loose, unhindered by any interior anxiety. They are relieved from the labor of working out and determining the position to be taken up, and their entire energy is free to skirmish outside—to attack, to defend, to repudiate, to “chaff,” to detect weak points in opponents’ armor, to summon up all available resources in succor of the position adopted. Definite and unhesitating convictions are an immense gain to the advocate and to the logician; they form the finest background for humor, for irony, for imagination. The man whose convictions are themselves in the act of growing is bound to offer magnificent opportunities to a quick and acute logic, and to a brilliant sense of the ridiculous. Such opportunities were never missed by Liddon. He had all his weapons ready. His appreciation of the absurd was like an instinct; and the moment that the absurd had been sighted, his imagination was up and after it like a greyhound slipped from the leash.

Here was his power in talk, and in writing. His intellect, as such, would never stir. You could anticipate, exactly, the position from which he would start. It never varied. He had won clear hold on the dogmatic expressions by which the Church of the Councils secured the Catholic belief in the Incarnation; and there he stood with unalterable tenacity. Abstract ideas did not appeal to him: for philosophy he had no liking, though, naturally, he could not fail in handling it to show himself a man of cultivated ability. But it did not affect him at all: he never felt drawn to get inside it. He did not work in that region. His mental tone was intensely practical; it was Latin, it was French, in sympathy and type. For Teutonic speculation he had a most amusing repugnance. Its misty magniloquence, its grotesque bulk, its immense clumsiness, its laborious pedantry, which its best friends admit, brought out everything in him that was alert, rapid, compact, practical, effective, humorous. There was nothing against which his entire armory came into more vivid play—his brilliant readiness, his penetrating irony, his quick sense of proportion, his admirable and scholarly restraint, his delicate grace, his fastidious felicity of utterance. There was no attraction on the speculative side to make him hesitate in these excursions of his; he

saw no reason to expect any gain from these philosophers, while, on the other hand, he was acutely alive to the perils of such intellectual adventures.

So he stood, absolutely rooted, in the region of thought. Nothing arrived to color, or expand, his intellectual fabric. To novel ideas—to the ideas that are still in growth, especially—he offered no welcome, so far as his own inner habit of mind was concerned. Of course, he was quick enough to perceive them, to estimate them, to handle them, to place them. He was on the alert to deal with them; he was acutely sensitive to the exact points at which they touched his position. But he never enjoyed them for their own sake. Reason to him was a tool, a weapon, a talent committed in charge; but hardly a life. And, perhaps, in saying all this, we can relieve Mr. Frederic Harrison of his wonder how any one, with a mind so unelastic, could have had such immense influence. As with the humorist, so with the orator and the preacher, a fixed intellectual base is an incomparable gain. The preachers who produce the deepest effect are those who, having fast hold of the elemental religious principles which their hearers already hold, but hold hesitatingly, or hold as in a dream, or hold without knowing what they hold, drags these out from the darkness in which they lie buried, or forces them into activity, and vividly manifests the reality of their application to heart and conduct. That is what moves men so profoundly; they come to church professing a creed, they hope that they believe it; but it slumbers, inoperative and inert, without practical force, without any direct or effectual significance. The preacher reads out the secret: he takes up this assumed creed; he gives it actual meaning; he spreads it out over the surface of life; he brings it to bear on the real facts of daily conduct with incision and with fire.

Now, in all this Liddon was supreme. Unelastic in his intellectual framework, he was eminently elastic in every other field of life—in sympathy, in imagination, in affection, in sensibility, in logical acuteness, in mental alertness, in modes of expression, in turns of feeling. Here, all was motion, rapidity, change. No one could appreciate a situation with a finer or more delicate intuition; no one could exhibit a more subtle variety of temperament, a more spontaneous identification of himself with the shifting needs of the moment. Here, he would “become all things to all men”; he would understand everything in a flash, the meaning would be caught up and expressed with pre-eminent happiness of insight. Thus he

had the double gift of the preacher. He impressed, he overawed, he mastered, by the sense of unshaken solidity which his mental characteristics assured to him. Men felt the force of a position which was as a rock amid the surging seas. Here was the fixity, the security, the eternal reassurance most needed by those who wondered sadly whether the sands under their feet were shifty or no. And yet, at the service of this unmoving creed was a brain, a heart, alive with infinite motion, abounding in rich variety, fertile, resourceful, quickening, expansive, vital.

And, if we add to this a strong will, possessed of unswerving courage, and utterly fearless of the world, we shall see that there was in him all the elements that constitute a great Director of Souls. For such a function he had just the right combination of gifts—rigid and decisive spiritual principles, applied to the details of life with all the pliability of a sympathetic imagination and of illuminative affection. The moment he entered the sphere of personal relations, his intense honor for each soul in its separateness, his exquisite courtesy, his unflinching tenderness, his eager unselfishness, his perfect simplicity, all served to temper and correct the rigidities of his intellectual formulae. It must remain to us a matter of poignant regret that he persisted in a strange and invincible refusal to undertake Retreats, for which he had shown, in early days at Cuddesdon, quite a peculiar aptitude, and for which he seemed obviously endowed with every qualification that could be desired.* He was a priest to the core of cores—a priest by nature as well as by grace. Already, as a boy, he moved about as a priest, among the rest, we are told. Instinctively he bent all to edification; instinctively he wore the names of others on his breast. I can hardly imagine any one who would surpass him in conducting a Clerical Retreat. He had all the strength and the gentleness, which, in union with his fine spiritual insight, would have ranked him, so far as we can judge, among the masters of the Spiritual Life. Yet, in spite of reiterated entreaties, he abstained from all such opportunities; he resolutely declared himself unfitted. He confined himself to private ministrations, to interviews, to letter-writing, holding himself, indeed, entirely at the mercy of correspondents, and keeping his door open to all who came there for counsel and good cheer.

I have attempted to show how unique was

the position of him whom we have lost. And such as this he has been for twenty-five years. There was nobody at all to challenge his particular position. That position was historically noticeable, in that, apart from his own personal eminence as a preacher and theologian, he served to bind the later Ritualistic movement to the old Tractarian centre. What we call "Ritualism" only means the effort to diffuse over the parish life of town and country that which the Tractarians had revived and secured in the University. This diffusion carried the movement far afield; it had to make adventurous experiments, often in young hands, under rough and irregular conditions. It might have got quite out of hand. And then, of course, the children of those who had stoned Tractarianism were now ready to glorify their old foe at the expense of their new and swarming enemy. They spoke of the academic dignity, of the illustrious learning, of the lofty intellectual calibre, of the great leaders of Tractarianism. This was safe enough now that most of those, who had not long ago gone over to Rome, were beginning to grow old and to die. They scornfully contrasted with these great names the unknown crowd of clergy, fervent but ignorant, who were spreading the new movement in lanes and slums. They were rash; they were reckless; they were silly. The movement, once so dignified, was vulgarized. So men complained; and it was everything that, at such a moment, there should be a personality like Liddon's in absolute touch with the new men, in fullest sympathy with all that they were attempting, and yet himself lodged tight and fast in honorable places of the old University—a professor, a theologian, a unique figure in its pulpit; and moreover, one to whom the outside public was compelled to listen with respect; who had a reputation which told on the imagination of the world at large. Thus, in binding the earlier and later stages of the Church movement together, Liddon, who was at once in the intimate and affectionate confidence of the great academic chief who still worked and prayed in the corner of the great quadrangle at Christ Church, and the greatest power in the pulpit at St. Mary's—and yet had also been the fellow-curate of Macknochie at Wantage, and had, as Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon, inspired the very men who were doing the Catholic work in street and field—Liddon was, for the last twenty-five years, of incalculable importance to the Church.

And it was in bridging these significant years by the force of a most noticeable per-

* Cf. R. Randall, "Retreat Addresses," Preface, p. xi.

sonality that he told, too, upon us, the younger brood at Oxford, to whom he gave himself in such simple and delightful familiarity. He introduced into our midst the intensity, the fibre, the moral toughness of the older Tractarians. He had their rigorous unworldliness, their unflinching courage, their disciplined self-repression, their definite and masterful direction, their spiritual beauty, their unearthly force. We, on the other hand, had come under many influences which were wholly foreign to all under which the older movement grew. The currents of thought that fed the education of the day had been changed. The English utilitarianism had yielded to the sway of speculative floods, which had been set moving in German Universities. These influences had gone very deep in us; they had passed into our innermost habits of reasoning; they had dyed our mental moods. Their pressure had fallen upon us just at an age when we were most receptive. We could not but be moulded and penetrated by them. The result was inevitable. Much to which Liddon had closed the door instinctively was already inside us by the very conditions of our growth. We had offered ourselves to it at an age when every door and window in us was as wide open as it could bear to be. We had therefore absorbed, according to our abilities, that which he held at arm's-length with suspicion and repugnance. This could not but tell in matters of Christian *Apology*. We had imbibed another logical temper from his; we could not approach a problem by his method, nor deal with it according to his measures. Others of his generation, and, above all, one still living of the generation older than his, whom it is needless to name, had, in all such matters, drawn much nearer to us than he. He resolutely kept himself aloof from the influences that had entered the modern life and had changed its intellectual temper.

This could not but be a sorrow; but yet it remained that, by different routes, we arrived at the same goal. Our conclusion was his conclusion. For still, it was "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Still, it was the doctrine of the Incarnation, as witnessed by Church and Scripture, which was the sum and substance of all our apology. All his positive vital convictions were ours also. And here he brought to bear upon us the authoritative correction which we, in our littleness, most needed. For we were shaken and confused by the new powers that had taken hold of the intellectual life. We were staggering about; we were often lifted off our feet.

We were weaklings caught in a strong stream. And it was everything to have before us one who gave us a standard of what spiritual conviction should mean; one who never cringed, or shrank, or compromised, or slid; one who looked unswervingly on the eternal things; one who was evidence to us of what the sacraments of the Incarnation could work in those who were yielded to them in body, soul, and spirit; one who had committed his all to the dominion and service of Christ, "casting down before it all reasonings and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." There he was; there was no mistaking him. He would die gladly for his creed; we felt it; we knew it; and it shamed us and braced us just when shame and bracing were most needful.

Ah! and then, on the common ground of his and our positive conviction, he gave us everything that was exhilarating and attractive in personal intimacy. He drew us with the cords of a man. He communed with us freely, with that most joyful and blessed communion of mind and heart which is impossible except for those who walk together in the same house of God as friends.

Only to those who came within the warmth and security of a common faith could be set free all the glowing fervors and the most radiant fascinations of his personal character. But to them everything was opened with the most winning freedom and in the richest abundance. To the very last it was the same. The bond held fast, however annoying and erratic we became. Never did I find him more buoyantly at ease, more brimming with confidential mirth and playful affection, than when I met him at Oxford on the Sunday before his final illness.

He was the most beautiful of friends. It is the loss of this that has taken so much sunlight from our days, and has made our daily life feel so beggared and so thin. Often and often in the years to come we shall turn, by happy habit, to feel it at hand, only to remember with a fresh touch of sadness that God has taken from us that presence that was so beautiful and so dear.

"All our days we shall go softlier, sadlier," as those who are aware that a glory has gone from their life; yet as those who, from the very bottom of their hearts, give thanks to the Lord and Saviour Who has him in good keeping, that it was once their honor and their joy to know and to love Henry Parry Liddon.

SOME ASPECTS OF NEWMAN'S INFLUENCE.

BY WILFRID WARD.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), October, 1890.

It has probably struck many persons that the general feeling of enthusiasm displayed on the occasion of Cardinal Newman's death has been quite out of proportion to the extent to which he or his writings are known. The thought that a great man has passed away, a high example of unworldliness been taken from us, has possessed many who felt and knew little more than this. It used to be said that the great Duke of Wellington's influence for good while he lived was immense, even on those who knew nothing of him except that a great example of English courage and English sense of duty was still among us. And in the sphere of spiritual life Newman had a similar influence.

The consequence has been, however, in the case of Cardinal Newman, that many who have written and spoken of him with genuine feeling—to whom the knowledge that the author of *Lead, kindly Light*, still lived and prayed at Birmingham was a real source of spiritual strength—have given a very imperfect account of the man himself. There have indeed been not a few beautiful sketches by personal friends and admirers. But he has also been described, both in print and in conversation, by epithets which have struck those who knew anything of his writings or himself with a sense of their incompleteness and unsatisfactoriness. "Mystic," "giant controversialist," "learned theologian," "recluse"—such descriptions have seemed little nearer the mark than the discoveries of the few who have found fault, and have noted that he lacked imagination, and that his style was in some respects inferior to that of Mr. Stevenson.

And yet perhaps the failure to characterise him rightly has arisen, in some cases, from the difficulty of the task—from the complexity of his nature. "Prose-poet" gives a fair description of Carlyle; "A great thinker inverse" is the true account of Browning by an able critic; but a many-sided genius like Newman's refuses to be explained or even suggested in a few words. And when we ask ourselves *why* we are dissatisfied with the epithets in question, it is not easy in a moment to give the reasons. The descriptions contain some truth. There was in him something of the mystic. He was full of power in controversy. His mind had been absorbed in patristic theology.

His life was one of seclusion. Yet these epithets, singly or collectively, quite fail to give any idea of him, or of the nature of his influence. We remember the story of the Buddhist who was asked to describe "Nirvana." "Was it annihilation?" "No," he answered impatiently. "Was it the beatific vision of the great unknown?" "No," with equal impatience, and so on with further queries. "What was it then?" "How can you ask what is so plain? . . . Nirvana is . . . *Nirvana*." And so in the present case. "Not a theologian, not a mystic, not a controversialist. Newman was *Newman*."

However, as many have succeeded in bringing out *some* at least of those distinctive elements which are felt in their combination by the majority of his readers, it may be worth while for each, according to his lights, to put his mite in contribution. Let us look through the phrases I have cited and attempt to limit their "connotation" as applied to Newman.

"Mystic!" Yes; he had a keen hold on the unseen world, on the mysterious teachings of conscience, on the shadow of God's presence in the human heart, and of God's wrath in the world at large. But the typical mystic lives in the clouds. He is not in touch with things around him. He is little interested in the microscopic inspection of the play of life about him. And what is to be said of the Cardinal from this point of view? He loved to talk on current topics of the day. "He was interested," says J. A. Froude, speaking of his Oxford days, "in everything which was going on in science, in politics, in literature." He could throw himself into spheres of action far removed from his own. "What do you think," a friend asked, "of Gurwood's *Despatches of the Duke of Wellington*?" "Think?" he replied; "they make one burn to have been a soldier!" His senses were keenly alive to the small things of earth. How delicately he weighs in *Loss and Gain* the respective attractions of sights, scents, and sounds! Ascetic though he was, he chose the wines for his college cellar at Oriel. Vivid and real as was the world of religious mystery to him, he could give the closest attention to matters of secular detail. He could, in a moment, pass from the greatest matters to the smallest. Gregory the Great left his audience with ambassadors to teach the Roman choristers the notes of the "plain song;" and so, too, Newman would leave the atmosphere of religious thought and meditation and betake himself to his violin. He is still remem-

bered by the villagers at Littlemore as teaching them hymn-tunes in their boyhood.* It was a recreation to him in later life to coach the Oratory boys for the *Pincerna*† or the *Aulularia*. He delighted in Miss Austen and Anthony Trollope. He enjoyed a good story from *Pickwick*. All this limits very much the popular idea of the word "mystic"; and yet all this is true of the man whose sense of religious mystery was surpassed by few.

"Giant controversialist!" Certainly the original edition of the *Apologia*, the *Letter* in answer to Pusey's *Eirenicon*, and the *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties* are masterpieces of religious controversy; and yet we can fancy the Cardinal smiling quietly if he heard himself spoken of as a "giant controversialist." "Tell me what books to read on such a subject," an old pupil asked him. "Why do you ask me?" was the answer; "I know nothing about books." How—we can see it in every page of his works—he hated the pedantry and parade of controversy! He would help inquirers, but he cared not to do the work of sledge-hammer argument. If it was done it was done for the sake of his friends and of anxious seekers after truth, and not for the sake of opponents whom he had no hope of convincing. He believed in the proverb, "He who is convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." He said fifty years ago that if views were clearly stated and candidly recognised, all controversy would be either superfluous or useless—superfluous to those whose first principles agreed, useless to those who differed fundamentally.‡ With him, controversy was chiefly exposition and the pointing out of mis-statements. There was little of direct argument. "Giant controversialist!" One can fancy the fate—there are stories on record as to the fate—of the pompous man who went to talk to him of controversy, as one great controversialist to another. One specimen of the class comes with notes, and books, and points for discussion on problems of education, but finds the Cardinal so absorbed with news about the "barley crop" in Norfolk that no other subject seems to interest him. Another presses him for a refutation of one of Mr. Gladstone's arguments against the Vatican decrees, but only succeeds in eliciting the reply that Mr. Gladstone is an old Oxford acquaintance, and has been very kind to him. Or, if the subject is insisted on, the conversation suddenly passes—his

visitor knows not how—to the oaks of Hlawarden and the exercise of cutting down trees. A third visitor finds himself engaged *in limine* in a discussion as to the number of stoppages in the 1.30 train as contrasted with the 3.40, and has unexpectedly to employ his conversational talent in explaining his cross-country route, and the lines by which he came. And then there is the Oxford story of Newman's guest who introduces the "origin of evil" at dinner, and at once produces a dissertation—full of exact knowledge, and apparently delivered with earnest interest—as to the different ways of treating hot-house grapes, and the history of the particular grapes on the table before him. Such are the stories, partly legends perhaps, which are current. Not that really anxious inquirers who approached him with tact could ever have such a tale to tell; with them he took infinite pains. But where the pomp of controversy was invoked by tactless or self-sufficient persons, he remembered the proverb, "Answer a fool according to his folly."

And what of "learned theologian"? An unquestionable truth; yet we cannot help seeing the Cardinal's smile again. Who that has read it can forget the irony of his description of the typical learned man, the historian, or archaeologist, or theologian, whose learning has overgrown and stiffened the freedom of his mind? It expresses the half-restrained irritation—half irritation, half amusement—of Cardinal Newman himself after a two hours' walk and talk with Mr. Casaubon. It may be read in a lecture delivered at Dublin, and is, perhaps, so little known as to be worth writing down here.

Such readers are only possessed by their knowledge, not possessed of it; nay, in matter of fact they are often even carried away by it, without any volition of their own. Recollect, the memory can tyrannise as well as the imagination. Derangement, I believe, has been considered as a loss of control over the sequence of ideas. The mind, once set in motion, is henceforth deprived of the power of initiation, and becomes the victim of a train of associations, one thought suggesting another, in the way of cause and effect, as if by a mechanical process, or some physical necessity. No one who has had experience of men of studious habits but must recognise the existence of a parallel phenomenon in the case of those who have overstimulated the memory. In such persons reason acts almost as feebly and as impotently as in the madman: once fairly started on any subject whatever, they have no power of self-control; they passively endure the succession of impulses which are evolved out of the original exciting cause; they are passed on from one idea to another, and go steadily forward, plodding along one line of thought in spite of the amplest concessions of the hearer, or wandering from it in endless digression

* *Guardian*, Sept. 3, p. 1,354.

† The *Pincerna* was Newman's expurgated version of the *Eumuchus*.

‡ Cf. *University Sermons*, pp. 500, 201.

in spite of his remonstrances. Now, if, as is very certain, no one would envy the madman the glow and originality of his conceptions, why must we extol the cultivation of that intellect which is the prey, not indeed of barren fancies, but of barren facts, of random intrusions from without, though not of morbid imaginations from within? And, in thus speaking, I am not denying that a strong and ready memory is in itself a real treasure; I am not disparaging a well-stored mind, though it be nothing besides, so that it be sober, any more than I would despise a bookseller's shop—it is of great value to others even when not so to the owner. Nor am I banishing—far from it—the possessors of deep and multifarious learning from my ideal university; they adorn it in the eyes of men: I do but say that they constitute no type of the results at which it aims; that it is no great gain to the intellect to have enlarged the memory at the expense of faculties which are indisputably higher.

Once more—"recluse!" He lived in the Oratory and saw little or nothing of the world. But where were the gloominess, the sternness, the unsociableness which the word suggests? As has been well said by a recent writer, his need of loneliness was fully balanced by his need of friendship. *Cor ad cor loquitur* was his motto, and it expressed the man. He loved to unbend among familiar friends. His sense of humour was of the keenest. His life-long habit, formed at Oxford, of living in intimacy with those whose objects were his objects, and who loved and understood him, had become to him a second nature. True, he despised the vanity of society. He felt the heartlessness of the world and withdrew from it. But he withdrew from the world only to give himself more fully to his friends. With his brilliancy and fastidiousness it might have been expected that the ideal of the best society, its exclusiveness and its refinement, would in early days have had some attraction for him (so at least the late Canon Mozley seems to hint); but there was in him a far deeper force which made him shun all that approached to dissipation of mind, and put away all that savoured of ambition. But it was not in the spirit of a hermit. The sternness of a recluse, the austerity of his demeanour, the marked protest against the rest of the world which the conception conveys, were uncongenial to him. He was like his own St. Philip Neri. An intimate friend of his has lately written on his "naturalness," on the simplicity with which he laughed at his own failures—"his floors," as he called them. Though his natural refinement was intense, there was no trace of anything artificial or of unreal reserve. "A. B. is a man one can't talk to in one's shirt sleeves," he would complain. Just as the abstraction of the mystic was not his, nor the pedantry

of the controversialist, so the pronounced rôle of a recluse was foreign to his nature. He loved to be as other men. His prayer for himself and his friends was, he said, not for those heavy trials some saints have asked for—persecution, calumny, reproach—but simply that they might be overlooked, passed over as members of the crowd.*

And thus we get from the limits which must be placed on the meaning of "mystic," "controversialist," "learned theologian," "recluse," as applied to Newman, a glimpse of one aspect of his distinctive charm—a kind of social charm rare in all classes, especially rare in one whose life-work is greatly that of the student. Men of letters and men of science are often known to men of the world as "book-worms," or regarded with distaste and some alarm as "very learned." And with a certain amount of ignorance implied in the tone of such unsympathetic judgments there is a bit of truth in them. Such men are often eccentric, and are wanting in the sense of humour which should teach them to avoid talking "shop," and to find common ground of converse with the rest of the world. Newman was the antithesis to the "book-worm" or the "learned man" as conceived by the man of the world. Full though he was of knowledge gained by observation and reading, he could and did put it entirely aside on occasion. He valued intercourse with his fellows more than mere study as a means of improvement. "Given the alternative," he once said, "in a University, of social life without study, or study without social life, I should unhesitatingly declare for the former, not the latter."† Life was for action, and action was determined by character. All his intellectual efforts were guided and limited by this thought. His sermons, his lectures, his philosophy at Oxford were all designed to meet the practical difficulties of those to whom he was a spiritual father. There was no rhetoric for rhetoric's sake; he never preached abstract dogma except as helping the spiritual life, nor philosophy as a speculative science, but solely as a practical help to those in doubt.

And this brings me to another point which I can only touch on briefly. The word "philosopher" has been used of him less often than the epithets I have referred to. It has been used by some of the best critics; yet it has been, by implication, denied by men who were in close contact

* *Sermons on Various Occasions*, p. 241.

† This sentiment is also expressed in the *Idea of a University*, 2nd edition, p. 205.

with him. Dean Stanley in his well-known estimate of the Oxford movement never once refers to the Oxford University sermons which were at that time the embodiment of Newman's philosophy. And one who opens these sermons will find nothing in the form of a philosophical treatise; nothing about the origin of ideas, about the categories, about the distinction between the pure and the practical reason. Yet those men of acute and religious mind who went to hear him, in doubt and trouble as to man's right to confident belief in the very being of a God and in the hope of immortality, came away reassured. Does philosophy require a formal and technical treatise, completely elaborated, on the human faculties and on metaphysics? If so, Newman was no philosopher. Is he a philosopher who takes in at a glance the root-problems as to what practical beliefs are reasonable in matters of deepest moment to each individual; who treats these problems in such a way as to help those in need, the deepest thinkers if so be; who treats them informally, suggestively, incompletely, seldom using technical language; who almost professes that he is not philosophising but only reminding us of the asseverations of sober common sense; who refrains from entering on questions which cannot help the action of practical life, but who gives to more systematic writers the groundwork, if they care to build on it, of a philosophy of faith, unsurpassed for breadth and depth, which he refrains from fully elaborating himself? If such a man is a philosopher—a religious philosopher—Newman was a great philosopher. His philosophy was like the rest of his work, the expression of his personality. It was the expression of his own deep reflections, as they came to him; of answers almost as he would have given them in conversation. When a conclusion was obvious he had not the pedantry to draw it. Where it would offend some and help others, again he would not draw it. He gave the materials for it which would be of service to the one class; he refrained from making the statement which would scare the other. Where a professional philosopher would press for a logical explanation, he would perhaps suddenly "shut up," and break off an argument which had really done its work, and pass on to something else instead of engaging in fruitless logomachy. When he had shown in the *Grammar of Assent* some of the strongest instances of clear and confident religious conclusions, which certain minds attain to without recognising more than mere suggestions of their real

premises, he foresaw the indignant objections of the incurable logician. But he had really said enough for his purpose, which was to show that such inferences in untrained minds may be practically reliable, and that was sufficient. He did not want to argue with the logician, he wanted to satisfy the simple mind that it was on the right road. So instead of an elaborate answer we find the following words: "Should it be objected that this is an illogical exercise of reason, I answer that since it actually brings them to a right conclusion, and was intended to bring them to it, if logic finds fault with it so much the worse for logic."*

In a similar spirit—though this is not an instance from his philosophy—when years ago he had strung together a *catena* of Catholic doctrines from Bull, Andrewes, and other Anglican divines, old Oxford men relate how he foresaw the objection, "But other passages from them tell a different tale." This opens an endless argument on Anglican inconsistency—endless and hopeless. It was enough for him to have got a rough *catena*—enough for the past, as much as could possibly be expected. He had never thought, as more sanguine men had, that Anglican tradition could be proved consistent; all he hoped was to show a tradition feeble enough at times, damaged by Protestant influences, yet never actually broken. Let the future be consistent. Let the dead past bury its dead. But he could not say all this in hearing of the Puseys and Palmers who thought otherwise. He must not break up his party by his own pessimism. So he gave this characteristic reply: "To say this is to accuse them of inconsistency, which I leave it for their enemies to do."

And so on throughout. What Dollinger styled Newman's "subjectivity" in philosophy, though the present writer does not believe that it diminishes the real objective value of his thought, was, in the sense of personal element, most marked. A recent critic has spoken of the *Grammar of Assent* as a treatise showing how things may be taken for granted. There cannot be a greater mistake, though the subjective mode of expression in some passages partly accounts for it. Newman shows that all begin with first principles which cannot be logically proven. He sees in himself religious first principles of which his nature assures him. He sees that those who cry out "You are taking them for granted" are themselves assuming a number of other first principles. A man who denies that

* *Grammar of Assent*, 5th edition, p. 403.

human nature is normally Christian assumes it to be something different. He starts with one conception of human nature as the Christian starts with another. A man who denies that conscience reveals sin, in the Christian sense of the word, *starts* with his own different impression of what conscience conveys, and proceeds to account for his impression as being due to an offence against society, or against law, or to an inherited feeling resulting from past experiences of general utility. Cardinal Newman's conclusion is not "We all assume unwarrantably," but rather, "You say I assume; I can at once retort *you* assume, but in fact I do *not* assume; I see with certainty." * Or, as he expressed it in a letter to myself written during his last years, "The religious mind must always master much which is *unseen* to the non-religious. . . . I can't allow that a religious man has no more evidence necessarily than a non-religious." †

The contrast between the arbitrary assumptions of the Agnostic and the first principles which a religious mind adopts rightly and with certainty, and the tests whereby they may be distinguished, were subjects which exercised his mind, as we see from his last publication in 1885, on *The Development of Religious Error*, to the very evening of life. But it would carry me too far to attempt here an analysis of that essay.

The personal element then, both in style and in matter, is most prominent. In the former it is the result of his object and his method, of helping others by his own personal influence, and by putting *himself* before them. In the latter it is on the principle which he maintains, that "egotism is true modesty." A strong man in fully revealing his own mind—its struggles and its victories—aids weaker minds in time of trial and difficulty.

Briefly it may be said that two points give the key to much of his work and influence, whether in philosophy, or in preaching, or in religious controversy, or in the guidance of individual consciences:—the power over others of his personality, and the exercise of that power with absolute simplicity to make men better than he found them. And as the peculiar power of his personality was that it appealed to such different minds, so, according to the bent and genius of each, his influence as a whole was most various. His was not simply a

spiritual influence, as John Wesley's; not merely that of the dry light of philosophy, as Kant's, or Coleridge's in our own country; nor of a brilliant converser and critic, as Johnson's; nor of intellectual and imaginative power, as Carlyle's; nor of the religious poet, as Keble's; nor of the Christian counsellor to the men and women of the world, as Fénelon's or St. Francis of Sales'. It was to each man one or more of these kinds of influence; and thus it was to all a combination of them.

Some of the most remarkable published testimonies to his early power over others come from men as different from each other as Mr. J. A. Froude, Principal Shairp, Dean Church, and Mr. Mark Pattison. While he influenced intellectualists like Pattison and Froude, and men of high mental gifts like Church, intellect was not in the least a necessary qualification for the most intimate friendship with him. This fact, which aroused Mark Pattison's supercilious contempt, was part of Newman's peculiar strength. Littlemore was no assemblage of intellectual lights; it was a community of religious and devoted friends—some, as Dalguirns, men of special mental gifts, others not so. Men living in the great world also, taking part in politics or public life, leant on him and appealed to him, as well as those whose life was in abstract thought or religious seclusion. To mention only a few and life-long friends, Lord Blachford, Lord Emly, and Mr. Hope Scott were as thorough in their personal allegiance to him as Dr. Pusey or the present Dean of St. Paul's. He himself has described that assemblage of qualities which constitute the perfection of University refinement, which make up the idea of a "gentleman," if not exactly in the popular English sense, still in the highest sense of the perfection of the intellectual and social nature.* He tells us that men may have those qualities and yet not be Christians; or they may have them and use the attractiveness they give simply for good. "They may subserve the education," he writes, "of a St. Francis of Sales or a Cardinal Pole; they may be the limits of the virtue of a Shaftesbury or a Gibbon. Basil and Julian were fellow students at the schools of Athens; and one became a Saint and Doctor of the Church, the other her scoffing and relentless foe." Newman had the qualities he describes,—they were a great part of his magnetism; they pervaded his writing and his conversation; and he used the influence they gave as St. Francis

* Cf. *Development of Religious Error*, p. 420.

† The Cardinal gave me permission in 1885 to make public use of any part of this letter, which is mostly a discussion on the nature of religious knowledge.

* The well-known description I refer to comes in *Idea of a University*, 2nd edition, pp. 305-9.

or Basil would have used them, but with greater variety of gifts than either, and over a more heterogeneous collection of disciples.

Beginning, then, at Oxford among young men, his equals in age many of them, passing into the comparative obscurity of the Birmingham Oratory, living there unseen by the world at large, holding for many years no position of official importance, his personality, in a manner so subtle that it is hard fully to account for it, made itself felt over the whole country. Leading the simple consistent life of a priest, ever ready to help those who came to him or wrote to him for advice, shunning the crowd, welcoming each individual, helping each according to his character to love God and to realise the true end of life, never seeking influence for his own sake, thinking only of those he was helping, grateful for their trust, but deeply feeling its sacredness before God and his responsibility for the use he made of it, throwing himself into the position of each of those who consulted him as if each were the only one, he gained steadily in immediate influence as life went on; while the power of good done, and of a devoted life, as a witness to the unseen world, made its way to the crowds who form public opinion. It would be hard to estimate the number of those who have sought his help, during the last forty years, on their road to the Catholic Church; and many more have been guided by him in other matters. In his measure, and allowing for the difference of gifts and circumstances, he carried out the kind of work done by his own St. Philip, which early in his Catholic life he had spoken of as the only work he had a call to do. The Cardinal's chief instruments were writing and correspondence, the Saint chose direct conversation; but the spirit of the work was the same in both cases. As St. Philip, by his love for those who leant upon him, and by his personal character, drew all men to him for guidance and advice, winning respect and esteem from Jews and Infidels as well as members of the Church, so did Newman, by the power of his personality, find himself the centre of influence among vast numbers, priests and laymen, non-Catholics as well as Catholics. The simple priest was by the popular voice called Apostle of Rome; the English Oratorian was, as a representative critic has expressed it, canonised at his death by the voice of the English people.

"Whether or not," he wrote early in his Catholic life, "I can do anything at all in

St. Philip's way, at least I can do nothing in any other. Neither by my habits of life, nor by vigour of age, am I fitted for the task of authority, or of rule, or of initiation." And what was St. Philip's way? Let us read his own beautiful account of it. It describes his aspiration in 1852; it describes the spirit of his work done in the Catholic Church forty years later.

He lived in an age as traitorous to the interests of Catholicism as any that preceded it, or can follow it. He lived at a time when pride mounted high, and the senses held rule; a time when kings and nobles never had more of state and homage, and never less of personal responsibility and peril; when medieval winter was receding, and the summer sun of civilisation was bringing into leaf and flower a thousand forms of luxurious enjoyment; when a new world of thought and beauty had opened upon the human mind, in the discovery of the treasures of classic literature and art. He saw the great and the gifted, dazzled by the Enchantress, and drinking in the magic of her song; he saw the high and the wise, the student and the artist, painting, and poetry, and sculpture, and music, and architecture, drawn within her range and circling round the abyss; he saw heathen forms mounting thence, and forming in the thick air:—all this he saw, and he perceived that the mischief was to be met, not with argument, not with science, not with protests and warnings, not by the recluse or the preacher, but by means of the great counter-fascination of purity and truth.

He was raised up to do a work almost peculiar in the Church: not to be a Jerome Savonarola, though Philip had a true devotion toward him and a tender memory of his Florentine house; not to be a St. Carlo, though in his beaming countenance Philip had recognised the aureole of a saint; not to be a St. Ignatius, wrestling with the foe, though Philip was termed the Society's bell of call, so many subjects did he send to it; not to be a St. Francis Xavier, though Philip had longed to shed his blood for Christ in India with him; not to be a St. Caetan, or hunter of souls, for Philip preferred, as he expressed it, tranquilly to cast in his net to gain them; he preferred to yield to the stream, and direct the current—which he could not stop—of science, literature, art, and fashion, and to sweeten and to sanctify what God had made very good and man had spoilt.

And so he contemplated as the idea of his mission, not the propagation of the faith, nor the exposition of doctrine, nor the catechetical schools: whatever was exact and systematic pleased him not; he put from him monastic rule and authoritative speech, as David refused the armour of his king. No; he would be but an ordinary individual priest as others, and his weapons should be but unaffected humility and unpretending love. All he did was to be done by the light, and fervour, and convincing eloquence of his personal character and his easy conversation. He came to the Eternal City and he sat himself down there, and his home and his family gradually grew up around him, by the spontaneous accession of materials from without. He did not so much seek his own as draw them to him. He sat in his small room, and they in their gay worldly dresses, the rich and well-born as well as the simple and illiterate, crowded into it. In the mid-heats of summer, in the frosts of winter, still was he in that low and narrow cell at San

Girolamo, reading the hearts of those who came to him, and curing their souls' maladies by the very touch of his hand. . . .

In the words of his biographer, "he was all things to all men. He suited himself to noble and ignoble, young and old, subjects and prelates, learned and ignorant, and received those who were strangers to him with singular benignity, and embraced them with as much love and charity as if he had been a long while expecting them. When he was called upon to be merry he was so: if there was a demand upon his sympathy he was equally ready. He gave the same welcome to all, caressing the poor equally with the rich, and wearying himself to assist all to the utmost limits of his power. In consequence of his being so accessible and willing to receive all comers many went to him every day, and some continued for the space of thirty, nay, forty years, to visit him very often both morning and evening, so that his room went by the agreeable nickname of the Home of Christian mirth. Nay, people came to him not only from all parts of Italy, but from France, Spain, Germany, and all Christendom; and even the Infidels and Jews who had ever any communication with him revered him as a holy man." The first families of Rome, the Massimi, the Aldobrandini, the Colonna, the Altieri, the Vitelleschi, were his friends and his penitents. Nobles of Poland, grandees of Spain, knights of Malta, could not leave Rome without coming to him. Cardinals, archbishops and bishops were his intimates: Federigo Boromeo haunted his room and got the name of "Father Philip's soul." The Cardinal-Archbishops of Verona and Bologna wrote books in his honour. Pope Pius the Fourth died in his arms. Lawyers, painters, musicians, physicians, it was the same too with them. Baronius, Zazzara, and Ricci left the law at his bidding and joined his congregation, to do its work, to write the annals of the Church, and to die in the odour of sanctity. Palestrina had Father Philip's ministrations in his last moments. Animuccia hung about him during life, sent him a message after death, and was conducted by him through Purgatory to Heaven. And who was he, I say, all the while, but an humble priest, a stranger in Rome, with no distinction of family or letters, no claim of station or of office, great simply in the attraction with which a Divine Power had gifted him? And yet thus humble, thus un-enobled, thus empty-handed, he has achieved the glorious title of Apostle of Rome.

And, in drawing to a conclusion, the present writer feels how much he has not even touched on which was essential to the Cardinal's influence. That unique gift which made one who was no orator the greatest preacher of his age; his faithfulness to his friends—"faithful and true," as he loved to say of Our Lord; his power of resentment of injury done to those he loved, or to his cause; the attractiveness which came of his sensitiveness, even of over-sensitiveness; the combination of far-seeing and dispassionate wisdom with keen and quickly-roused emotion; his tenderness for and sympathy with the distressed in faith, which made others even fear, at times, lest, in meeting them half-way, he was losing sight of the very principles he was in reality pro-

tecting; the very "defects of his qualities," which his closest friends loved almost as they did his virtues—which made him so truly human amid his greatness; these were all part of him, though this is not the time or place to speak of them fully. But the thought of them makes me fall back upon the description with which I began as the only true one, that as Nirvana is Nirvana, so Newman was Newman.

THE JEWS IN RUSSIA.

BY E. B. LANIN.

From *The Fortnightly Review* (London), October, 1890.

Something is wrong, there needeth change.
But what or where?

Song of Rabbi Ben Ezra.

It has often been a matter of wonder to me that in these days of rapid communications, "private wires," special correspondents and international journalism, so very little should be known and so very much rashly written in this country about Russia. France, Germany, and England are perhaps equally guilty of this crime of *lèse-majesté* against reason—their writers and politicians forming and expressing confident opinions about important questions, without the slightest foundation in fact,—and Englishmen have not quite so much reason to blush as their neighbours, seeing that they are but a little less familiar with the economical, intellectual, and moral condition of a foreign and not over friendly people than with that of their own kith and kin in the colonies. A more serious excuse might perhaps be found in the circumstance that the press of the country rather than its readers should bear the blame of ignorance which is, in many cases, equalled only by conceit; as it is the press that furnishes the so-called facts, solemnly pledging itself to their accuracy, while the public can no more be condemned for not sifting them critically than a bookkeeper can be blamed for not spending his time in verifying the statements of his ready-reckoner. Thus a few months ago *The Times*, through its correspondent, informed its readers that Madam Tsebrikoff had been exiled to Pensa in the Caucasus, whither she was being driven in a *kibitka*, thus giving circulation to a statement containing about as much truth and meaning as if a Russian journal of the same day had announced that Mr. Davitt had been imprisoned by the Irish Secretary in

the frightful prison of Sing Sing, in Tipperary.

Two months ago a "well-informed" and "widely circulated" paper assured its readers that a new and barbarous law had just been passed in Russia, the practical effect of which was to doom the unfortunate Jews of that country to exile or death; and this caterer for political information for the million was so well informed of what was passing in "higher spheres" in Russia, that he was able to quote textually several clauses of the new law, the mere perusal of which reminded Englishmen—who had begun to grow as tired of Stanley as of the fasting man—of the halcyon days of Bulgarian horrors. And it needed several weeks of the most solemn assurances of the Russian Government to allay an excitement that ought either never to have been roused or to have made itself felt to some good purpose some years ago.*

As a matter of fact, no project of law ever passes the Imperial Council in June, July, or August, because there are no sittings of that body all through the summer months, and consequently the statement of the correspondent could not have deceived any one who had any real knowledge of Russia. Moreover, it has never been a serious question, with those who govern the Russian Empire, of banishing the Jews *en masse*, as they were expelled from Spain in 1492. A portion of the Russian press has, it is true, often advocated this drastic method of dealing with them, but the press has less effect on the Government than the scarcely audible buzz of the tiny fly struggling in the web on the callous spider that eyes it coldly from on high.

On the other hand, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that because the Russian Government goes methodically to work, judiciously blending cunning with cruelty, patience with hatred, the lot of the Jews is an enviable one; just as it would be wrong to conclude that, because prisoners in Russia are often treated with more revolting cruelty than African slaves, the movement now on foot to put an end to the slave-trade in Africa has therefore lost its *raison d'être*. How far the lot of the Russian Jews will enlist the sympathies of Englishmen is in truth of very scant importance to any one; to what extent it deserves those sympathies may perhaps appear from a simple statement of the case.

In the olden times of the Grand Duchy

of Moscow there was no Jewish question to disturb the peace of mind of Russian statesmen: the peaceful Jews were then kept out of the country more successfully than the martial Tartars, more resolutely than the plague. Every Jew found there was seized and expelled,* no reason, however weighty, being accepted as sufficient to justify the pollution of the land by the presence of a member of the race that crucified the Saviour. And thus the native population were left to their own devices—the stream of Russian civilisation kept exceptionally pure from Jewish admixture—until the policy of annexation was first fairly inaugurated, when Russia ravenously swallowed, along with the luscious morsels that belonged to her neighbours, the trichines that found such a congenial soil in her body politic and are now bidding fair to bring about a collapse of the entire system. The struggles of Russia now to throw off, now to assimilate and neutralise this dangerous element, are instructive if not edifying.

Little Russia was the first territory annexed, and with it were taken over the Jews who for generations had been wont to look upon that country as their fatherland. But if the Little Russians, who had been induced to unite by tempting promises, were treated with scant ceremony, the Jews could scarcely complain of receiving still less, and in 1727 the High Privy Council promulgated an order signed by the Empress Catherine I., to expel the "scurvy Jews,† male and female, who are living in Ukraine (Little Russia) and in Russian cities generally, and never again to allow them under any pretext to re-enter the country, and to take due care that in future the land be vigilantly guarded and kept free from them." But as the frontier, even in those days, was extensive, its guardians venal, and the Jews persevering and ingenious, many of the latter succeeded in maintaining their foothold without sacrificing their religion. Peter II., the gentleness of whose character reflected itself in the irresolution of his policy, relaxed the severity of this law to the extent of allowing Jews to visit South Russia for the purpose of attending the fairs there; a privilege which he thoughtfully saddled with the condition "that they should not take out of the

* Cf. Complete Code of Laws, No. 662, year 1676. In a treaty concluded with Poland in 1678 it was expressly stipulated that "the merchants and tradesmen of both sides will be free to travel without hindrance into each other's country 'except the Jews.'"—*Ibid.*, No. F90.

† There is no adjective in the original, but the word for Jews is an approbrious one implying still more than is expressed by the epithet I have added. The same word is still employed by such conservative organs of the Russian press as the semi-official *Noroye Vremya* and *Grashdanin*.

* It is only fair to say that the *Daily Telegraph* published a few serious papers on Russian Jews at the time, denying the promulgation of new laws, and giving a fairly complete and very candid statement of the whole question.

country gold or silver money, nor even copper coins." "As to living in Little Russia," this curious ukase concludes, "it is strictly forbidden, nor shall any one dare to harbour scurvy Jews; in all these respects it is decreed that the ukase of the year 1727 shall remain in force."*

The Empress Anna, in the beginning of her reign, gave permission to Jews to visit Russia for purposes of commerce, but shortly before her death, repenting of that and other sins, reverted to the old policy of exclusion, which, however, was again for a time suspended during the Russo-Turkish war. In 1742, the Empress Elizabeth framed still more stringent laws against the Jews than any of her predecessors, and piously appealed to heaven for her warrant. "Except irremediable harm to our faithful subjects nothing can ever come of the presence in the land of such inveterate haters of the name of Christ the Saviour."†

Catherine II., whose policy was as little guided by her philosophy as were the metaphysics of many venturesome old schoolmen by their religious faith, began by following in the steps of her predecessors, and in the manifesto she issued during the earlier part of her reign inviting foreigners to come and settle in Russia, in consideration of special privileges offered them, Jews were expressly mentioned as disqualified. But the annexation of certain Polish governments, inhabited by large numbers of Jews, which she soon afterwards effected, compelled her to modify a policy that was based upon changing interest rather than fixed principle; and in the year 1763 she permitted the Jews to make Russia their home, on condition that they settled exclusively in the south, in the government of New Russia. This decree‡ was the foundation-stone of the famous *Pale of Settlement*, which remains to the present day the main grievance of the Jews—the fruitful source of all their sufferings. All followers of the Mosaic law who inhabited the Polish provinces at the time of their annexation were allowed to remain where they were, and to enjoy the same rights as Russians; but it was not open to them to circulate in Russia proper, and towards the close of the Empress's reign they were condemned to pay double taxes.§

But all these attempts of Russia to kick against the pricks proved ineffectual. The Jews obeyed the laws of nature rather than those of shortsighted men, with results that alarmed the statesmen who were responsible for having made the two incompatible. An

Imperial Commission was then created (1802), by the Emperor Alexander surnamed the Blessed, to study the question, and two years later a law was passed which appears to have been an honest endeavour to carry out two opposite lines of policy, on the principle of doing incompatible things by halves. One half of the measures are intended to protect the Christians against the heartless exploitation of the Jews, who are thus treated as born enemies of their Orthodox fellow subjects, while the other half is meant to bring about the brotherly union and ultimate amalgamation of the two avowedly hostile races. Very sordid motives were put before them to induce them to become Christians, care being meanwhile taken to keep them well within their *Pale of Settlement*, which was considerably narrowed, no Jew being allowed to live within fifty versts of the frontiers. It was obviously legislation of the half-hearted kind—an attempt (to use a popular Russian expression) to give the wolves a feed and keep the sheep whole, and like all such efforts it deservedly failed.

The Emperor Nicholas began his reign by issuing various ukases in the same spirit—forbidding the Jews to circulate in Russia, narrowing the *Pale* still more by excluding from it the cities of Kieff, Nicolaieff, Sebastopol, and even certain of the streets of Vilna, and generally carrying out a policy of mild repression. On its becoming obvious in 1835 that most of these measures were but mere waste paper, the whole structure of previous legislation was pulled down and a bill passed "to enable Jews to live comfortably as tillers of the soil or artisans, and to keep them from idleness and illegal occupations." They are permitted by this law to attend fairs in the great centres of Russia—Nischny Novgorod, Irbitk, Khar-koff, &c.—and special privileges are promised to those who turn their attention to the cultivation of the soil, an occupation which had proved so fatal to Russian Christians. The legislator was evidently desirous on the one hand of removing all distinctions between Jews and Christians, and on the other of localising the religion of the former as he would an infectious disease. Evidence of the former disposition is to be found in the clauses which throw open schools, gymnasies, universities, and other educational establishments to the members of the proscribed faith, and proof of the latter in the express declaration that in country districts the Jews were, as theretofore, to remain aloof from their Christian fellow-subjects, their communes to be sepa-

* Complete Code of Laws, No. 5324.

† *Ibid.*, No. 8673. ‡ *Ibid.*, No. 13383. § *Ibid.*, No. 17224.

rated from those of Orthodox Christians; and even in the cities the same barriers and distinctions to be rigorously maintained. Worse than all, as soon as it became evident that the proscribed people thoroughly appreciated the offer of education, by sending their children to Christian schools, where they became the most successful pupils and students, the Emperor issued another ukase (in 1844) to the Minister of Public Instruction, declaring it necessary to open Jewish schools for Jewish children, and ordering him to appoint a commission of rabbis to draft a scheme and to see that a special tax be levied on the Jews for the support of these denominational establishments.

The late Czar Alexander II. was desirous of contributing as far as was possible, by means of legislation, to the assimilation of the Jewish element by the Christian population, but before taking any steps towards the accomplishment of this desire, he ordered the Minister of the Interior to have detailed reports drawn up by the governors and governors-general of the districts inhabited by Jews concerning the working of the laws already in force and the defects remarked in their conception or administration. The Governors of the provinces of Vitebsk, Mohileff, and Minsk gave it as their opinion that the Jews of their districts were suffering incalculable harm from the action of the law depriving them of the rights of ordinary Russian subjects without relieving them of any of the corresponding obligations. Moreover, the towns, they added, in which Jews were authorised to live were so congested that they could get but little work to do; and "when they do receive orders for work, they are compelled to have recourse to fraud. This explains why they so often become noxious members of society, instead of conferring upon the community and upon themselves those benefits which, under more favourable conditions, one would naturally expect from them." The Governor of Poltava informed the Minister that the Jews of the south of Russia differed to a very considerable extent in language, dress, and mode of life from their co-religionists in other parts of the empire, and that the difference was entirely to their advantage. As a result of this, "they have almost wholly assimilated themselves with the native population; wherefore I would respectfully suggest that all the restrictions now in force against them be forthwith abolished." The remaining governors were of the same opinion, and the Minister of the Interior came to the conclusion that the accumulation of skilled Jewish artisans and

workmen in the cities of the Pale of Settlement, and the competition resulting between themselves on the one hand and between them and the Christians on the other, "have an exceedingly injurious effect on both sides."

Nothing could be more candid than this avowal, nothing more well meaning than the intentions it called into being; but between intentions and their realisation lies an abyss—at times an impassable one. "Before the sun rises," says a Little Russian proverb, "the dew may eat one's eyes out." Half-hearted measures of relief were gradually doled out, certain restrictions abolished wholly or in part, and the administration of the existing laws became less severe, a difference which was, in itself, as long as it lasted, almost as welcome as a repeal of the exclusive legislation complained of. For men, not measures, really rule or ruin the nation; no other country possessing such a ponderous, voluminous collection of laws as the Empire of the Tsars, no other people so utterly lacking the conception of law, as of established rules to be respected and obeyed; and what can be more demoralising to a nation than the possession of laws, the transgression of which is the rule, the observance the rare exception?

Had the Emperor Alexander II. lived a year or two longer, it is highly probable that there would now no longer be a Jewish question in Russia; for the emancipation of that people was one of the points of the constitution which he had consented to grant. His son and successor is credited with a strong personal dislike to all followers of the Mosaic law, and is resolved, men say, to grind them down to the intellectual (they are already far below the economic) level of his Orthodox subjects. As this would be a heinous crime, it may possibly be a foul-mouthed calumny; but it is not a dispassionate survey of the main acts of his reign that would bring one to doubt the truth of the assertion. The chief measure now in force against the Jews is—and has been since the days of Catherine II.—the prohibition to leave the Pale of Settlement. No doubt this district is immense in extent, comprising the governments of Vilna, Volhynia, Grodno, Kovno, Minsk, Podolsk, Yekaterinoslav, Poltava, Tshernigoff and, under certain restrictions, portions of Kieff, Vitebsk, and Mohileff.* But for the Jews, who are not tillers of the soil, who are compelled to belong to merchant guilds or trade corporations that exist only in cities and

* Cf. Law concerning Passports and Runaways, vol. II., division I., chap. I., art. 16.

towns, and are debarred from engaging in many pursuits open to Christians, the immensity of this territory shrinks to an incredible extent. And lest the Pale, even thus narrowly circumscribed, should seem too vast a hunting-ground for the "scurvy Jew," his Majesty enacted, two years ago, that "until further orders," no Jew will be permitted to leave the villages or hamlets in which they were living up to the 15th May, 1882. And as during those six years hundreds, nay thousands, of families changed their place of residence to other villages and towns, the execution of this law has reduced a large number of Jews to misery and ruin; for not only do those suffer who are compelled to leave villages where they have their houses and their capital, but the community to which they are compelled to return, and in which competition has already reduced wages to the starvation line. So that the arena is in reality very circumscribed in which Jew meets Jew in the bitter struggle for life, and defeating his adversary inflicts incurable wounds upon himself.

There are one or two narrow and winding paths that lead out of this human penfold, but those who take them have often cause bitterly to regret their enterprise or unrest. Jews who have traded for not less than five years as members of the first merchant guild* within the Pale have the right to apply for admission to the same guild outside of it. But the exercise of this right bristles with difficulties. Thus, to say nothing of the petitions which he must send to the guilds, the police, the governors, and others, the merchant's first real embarrassment is caused by the law which prohibits him from hiring Christian servants, coupled with the circumstance that he has no hope of finding any in Russia proper, where Jews are few and belong exclusively to the privileged classes from which the ranks of domestic servants are never recruited. The law † which obtained under former Emperors allowed the merchant in this case to petition the Prefect of the Police of St. Petersburg or the Governor-General of Moscow—if his destination were either of these cities—for permission to take with him from the Pale a certain number of clerks and domestic servants, setting forth in the petition the reasons that determined him to fix the particu-

lar number asked for. It then depended on the decision of these dignitaries how many might accompany him, and from their decision there was no appeal. If he chose some other city for his abode, he was allowed but one clerk and four domestic servants, all of whom must be of irreproachable character and free, not only from the accusation, but even from the suspicion of crime. It is as easy to imagine the innumerable and serious embarrassments that this law is calculated to raise up in the every-day life of the Jewish merchant—the loss of time, of money, of health—as it is difficult to divine the good purpose which the legislator had in view in framing it. That law is still in force; but, apprehensive that the permission it accords is far too extensive, his present Majesty's advisers have decreed that in case the merchant should dismiss or otherwise lose his servants, it shall not be open to him to send to the Pale for others to replace them, but he must shift as best he can.* Moreover, if from any cause whatever he cease to belong to the first guild before the lapse of ten years, he forfeits his right to reside in Russia and must return to the Pale. The circumstance that he availed himself during his stay of his legal right to purchase house property or land in Russia proper, is not deemed sufficiently grave to cause an exception to be made in his favour. Landlord or householder, it matters not, the law compels him to leave everything and return to the Pale, and logic and humanity are utterly powerless to help him.†

In Russia every Jew is compelled to belong to one of the established classes into which the tax-paying community is divided, and unless he have been received into one of the learned professions, he must be at all times ready to prove by documents, that require to be renewed every year, that he is a skilled artisan, a merchant of one of the two guilds, a petty trader, or an agriculturist. This means, besides endless worry and frequent insults from secretaries and petty puffed-up officials, the payment of considerable annual fees and—what is sometimes more irksome and oppressive—permanent residence in the city or town in which his guild or corporation has its headquarters.‡ If sheer want and the evident hopelessness of relieving it in a given town compel a Jew to disregard this law and wander about from place to place, as many have done and still

* In Russia there are two merchant guilds (there were three till a few years ago): the members of the first pay much higher fees than those of the second, and both pay larger fees and taxes than the petty traders. One must be a man of considerable means to belong to the first merchant guild in St. Petersburg or Moscow. In the latter city there are but four hundred members of the first guild all told, many of whom are foreigners.

† Vol. xiv., div. i., chap. i., art. 16.

* Decision of Minister of Interior and Minister of Finances, given on 17-29 April, 1885.

† Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, No. 41779 and 48175.

‡ Complete Collection of Laws, vol. xiv., div. i., chap. i., arts. 1 and 2.

are forced to do, he is arrested and treated or maltreated as that most miserable of human wretches, a Russian *brodyag*.*

But, independently of those general taxes paid by Jews for the support of institutions from the benefits of which they are in most cases expressly excluded, they are also subjected to a special system of taxation, from which Christians are exempt, and which, though destined in theory for the special needs of the Jewish community, are nevertheless employed in part to replenish the imperial coffers.† Thus the so-called "Box-tax"‡ is one of the most comprehensive tributes ever levied upon a community, its oppressiveness being intensified by the odious method practised of farming it out to greedy speculators. For every animal, fowl, and bird killed for food according to Jewish rites (Kosher) a fixed sum has to be paid. And on every pound of that same meat, and on every one of those identical fowls, an additional sum is levied when they are sold. Jews who have taken their degrees in universities, or have succeeded in gaining admission to a learned profession, may, on satisfying their butcher that they are doctors or masters, purchase a certain quantity of animal food free of this duty: viz., two pounds and a half of meat a day, if the privileged person is single, and four pounds and a half if married; he may also, if a bachelor, purchase on the same advantageous conditions one fowl or bird daily, and two if he be a family man.§ In addition to this there is a candle tax, the proceeds of which are employed to support those denominational schools with which the Jews would most gladly dispense, if they were allowed to avail themselves of the ordinary educational establishments, to which they have quite as much right as their Christian fellow subjects. Over and above these oppressive tributes, all Jews have to pay a certain percentage—from which Christians are, of course, exempt—on the rent they receive for their houses, shops, stores, granaries; on the gross income they receive from the sale of wine in public-houses and inns; they are likewise subject to a special annual tax on distilleries and breweries, glass works, copper and iron works, tar, pitch, and tallow works, and for the permission to set up

as cattle-breeders. In addition to this, all money left by deceased Jews pays a fixed percentage to the same common fund; and finally a fine is paid for the authorisation to wear Hebrew apparel. "All Jews who desire to wear a skull cap" (I am quoting textually from the Statute book), "are hereby subjected to a permanent tax of neither more nor less (*sic*!) than five silver roubles a year each."* This is not an extract from obsolete laws framed during the Middle Ages, but a clause of a law drawn up in the last quarter of the sober nineteenth century, and strictly enforced to-day. That the legislator was in grim earnest about the matter is evident from the following provision concerning the wearing of other articles of Jewish dress: "In fixing the amount of taxes to be levied for the right of wearing Hebrew dress, male and female, the governor of the district is hereby enjoined to take heed that it be considerably augmented in comparison with the other objects subject to the Box-Tax."†

It is difficult to convey anything like an adequate idea of the vexation, disputes, and bad blood caused by the spirit in which this law is administered. But it is scarcely needful to descant upon the spirit, when the letter itself contains so much to bear out the charge of deliberate injustice which has been frequently advanced against it. Take, for instance, the provision made for the not uncommon case in which the animal or fowl is slaughtered in one place and sold in another. "Whereas the Box-Tax is levied according to weight on the sale of the objects liable to it, be it ordained that if a Jew, having slaughtered an animal within the boundaries of one tax farm, desire to carry it to another for the purpose of selling it, he is liable to pay the tax in the first tax-farming district for the slaughter alone; but the tax farmer of the second district possesses the right to exact payment both of the tax for slaughter and also of the tax for sale."‡ This is but a sample. The voluminousness and minuteness—to say nothing of the vexatiousness—of the laws against the Jewish millions who have appreciably contributed economically and intellectually to the prosperity of the Empire, would drive any one but a Talmudist or a Benedictine to despair.

But besides merchants of the first guild, university graduates of the highest standard, and doctors and masters, are also privileged to pass beyond the Pale of Settlement.

* This terrible word *brodyag* does not convey much to the ordinary English reader. Those who are curious to know something of the indescribable tortures inflicted on this army of unfortunates will find some facts relating to the subject in *The Fortnightly Review*, July, 1890, in the article on "Russian Prisons." Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, vol. ix., art. 933.

† Complete Collection of Laws, vol. v., art. 281; Supplement, chap. i., art. 1.

‡ So called because the proceeds were kept in a box employed solely for this purpose.

§ Supplement to article 281 of fifth vol. of Laws.

* Complete Collection of Laws, vol. v., art. 10, observ. 4.

† Supplement, chap. iii., art. 14.

‡ *Ibid.*, Supplement, art. 45.

Skilled artisans can likewise seek admission to the corporations, or "Tsekhs," of their respective calling in any part of the empire. This clause enfranchises, to all appearance, a numerous class of men, which might perhaps be made to include the best portion of the Hebrew people. These appearances, which would probably be trustworthy enough if observed in any other part of Europe, are rightly deceptive in Russia, and Englishmen who come in contact with the wan, worn, wizen-faced Russian Jews—like so many Lazaruses risen too late from the dead to live longer than a few short hours—who played such a tragic part in the sweating scandals that came to light in London some time ago, will readily understand that the children of creatures of this stamp—and the majority of Russian Jews are such—have as much chance of becoming astronomers as of qualifying for what the law in Russia understands by "skilled artisans." It is less difficult, however, for the daughters of the classes who possess a fairly sufficient income to become midwives—a profession which also confers upon those who practise it the right of passing beyond the Pale.* But his present Majesty's Government, noticing that many young Jewesses succeeded in passing the examinations required for the certificate of midwife, instead of withdrawing the privilege accorded by law to this profession, as would be natural under the circumstances, acted somewhat like the scrupulous Quaker of apocryphal celebrity who, when the pirate caught hold of one of the ship's ropes in order to board the vessel, exclaimed: "Thou wantest this rope, friend?" (and speedily cutting it) "take it; may it stand thee in good stead"; they confirmed the privilege, but explained that from December, 1885, it would not extend from midwives to the children of such Jewesses, who would be compelled to live in the Pale.† Another instructive instance of the way in which laws favourable to the Jews can be made oppressive without being formally abolished occurred two years ago in Kieff. A certain M. Goldenberg, who had obtained his degree at the University, and is therefore qualified to live in Russia proper, own houses, and land, &c., resolved to hand over to his wife a house that belonged to him in the Sophia Street. The deed of transfer was duly drawn up, but the authorities refused to register it. M. Goldenberg appealed to the law courts, relying upon the

express terms of the law (Art. 100, vol. x., parts 1 and 5), which enacts that the husband communicates all his civil rights and privileges to his wife. But the law courts decided that every statute concerning the Jews must be interpreted in a restrictive sense, and consequently they upheld the refusal of the authorities to validate the act of transfer, dismissing the suit with costs, on the ground that, though M. Goldenberg himself possesses civil rights, he does not communicate them to his wife.

The most arduous way of obtaining the right of free circulation throughout the empire would naturally seem that which leads through the universities, or one of the higher educational establishments, for the children of men who can never tell in the morning whether they and their families may not have to go to bed supperless at night. And yet so painfully vivid was the consciousness of the horrors from which they would thus escape, so powerful the aversion to go back to vegetate and rot in the hateful Pale, that hundreds of young men entered the universities, valorously battled for years with want, sickness, and discouragement, many of them like Heyne, the German classical scholar who first raised philology to the dignity of a science, often exchanging their dinner for tallow-candles, which burned during whole nights in their garrets and cellars, lighting them on to knowledge and to fame. And the Government, seeing that knowledge is power, and that it is not good that power should be placed in the hand of "vile Jews," resolved to close up this issue out of misery, ignorance, and the Pale. When the present Czar succeeded to the throne the educational law, in so far as it affected the right of Jews to have their children taught in the ordinary schools of the empire, was formulated as follows: "Jewish children may be admitted into and educated in the State educational establishments, private schools, and boarding schools of the districts in which they reside, no difference whatever being made between them and other children."* This law was in force down to the 19th June, 1885, when his Majesty ordered the admission of Jews to the Technological Institute † of Kharkoff to be limited to 10 per cent. of the total number of students. Nine months later his Majesty was "graciously pleased," says the official document, "to forbid absolutely the admission of any Jew to the Veterinary Institute of Kharkoff." On the 17th December,

* Coll. of Laws, vol. xiv., sect. i., chap. lii.

† Decision of the Department of the Police on the 30th December, 1885.

* Coll. of Laws, vol. ix., book i., chap. iv., art. 966.

† There are but two Technological Institutes in all Russia.

1886, the present Minister of Public Instruction—an Armenian by birth—promulgated a law the preamble of which declared that whereas very many young Jews, eager to partake of the benefits of higher classical, technical, and professional education, were annually presenting themselves for admission to the universities, &c., passing the examinations and prosecuting their studies in the various establishments of the empire, it was found desirable to put a stop to such an unsatisfactory state of things, to which end it was enacted that in future the number of Jewish students in Russian universities should not exceed 10 per cent. of the entire number of students in the universities within the Pale, 5 per cent. in other provincial universities, and 3 per cent. in those of Moscow and St. Petersburg; and on the 8th July, 1887, the same measure was applied to all gymnasies or grammar schools without exception.

The immediate results of this curious legislation were painful in the extreme; thousands of young men who, by dint of years of hard, steady work and stoic self-denial on their part and on the part of their parents, had at last come within sight of the promised land, were rudely awakened from their day-dreams and jeeringly told to return to their "vile" people to live and die, pariahs among helots. I shall never forget the harrowing scenes I witnessed, the tears, the entreaties, the wailing and despair immediately after the passing of that drastic law: parents begging their Christian friends—ay, and entreating their Christian enemies—to intercede with the minister to except their only child from the operation of the Act; young boys putting on the ill-fitting masks of dissimulation and endeavouring by flattery administered to the sons of high officials—their own schoolfellows—to obtain permission to finish the studies already brilliantly begun or well-nigh ended; orthodox priests, grave Russian officials, and even well-known statesmen gibing and jeering at the checkmated Jew. One of the bitterest and possibly best deserved reproaches which Christian writers administer to Julian the Emperor was the insidiousness of his persecution of the Christians, as manifested in the order he issued prohibiting them from attending lectures in the schools. Julian couched that order in language as elegant and brilliant as that of Lucian, and defended it with arguments worthy of Aristotle—inulnerable to anything more logical than an appeal to a highly-developed sentiment of humanity. The legislators of Holy Russia succeeded in

closely copying Julian's insidiousness without imitating his wit or appreciating his logic. My readers do not, I feel confident, need to be told whether the grave legislators of a vast empire engaged in the practical solution of a most delicate question—fate of millions of their subjects—are justified in giving to laws adverse to these millions the odious form of a sneer at their religious tenets. It had been usual in Russia at all times to profess and occasionally to practise respect for the Jewish observance of the Sabbath. Jewish boys were not compelled to attend school on Saturdays, nor witnesses—if they objected—to take an oath in courts of justice on that day. But since the present Czar ascended the throne all that has been changed. Thus, among the laws concerning the education of Jews we read: "The learned Committee of the Ministry of Public Instruction, having deliberated upon the question whether Jewish pupils of grammar schools should be excused from written examinations on Saturdays, . . . decided that once they enter public educational establishments Jews are bound to submit to the rules thereof, and the *very act of entrance into these schools is of itself a proof that they and their parents have outgrown that exclusiveness which stickles for the strict observance of the Sabbath.*"* This jest is the deliberate work of the most learned body of men in the most enlightened department of the Government of Russia—work for which they are paid out of the hard-earned wages of the Jew, at whose religious convictions and moral courage they thus poke fun!

The circumstance that Jewish children seek for education in schools founded for children belonging to all religious persuasions being thus authoritatively construed as a proof that they and their parents laugh in their sleeves at one of the fundamental tenets of their faith, the only course open to parents who objected to the practical consequences of this interpretation was to found schools of their own—a costly solution, it is true, but the only feasible one. Several communities unhesitatingly adopted it and set about availing themselves of the law which conferred this right upon them.† But the Government, informed of their intention, forthwith repealed that law, and declared by a decree of the Minister of Public Instruction that it was no longer advisable to authorise the opening of such schools, inasmuch as the ordinary educational estab-

* Circular of the Ministry of Public Instruction, No. 15038.
† Collection of Laws, vol. ix., sect. i., art. 969, and observations.

lishments that exist for children of all religious persuasions outside the Pale would also satisfactorily meet the requirements of the Jews.* The logical outcome of these two legislative acts is therefore that, on the one hand, Jewish parents desirous of having their children instructed must send them to Christian schools, if there happen to be a vacancy there; and on the other hand, their doing so is regarded by the Government as a sort of mild apostasy, in consequence of which they will be no longer treated as strictly orthodox Jews.

Thus foiled and checkmated on every side, small wonder that some of the most ambitious or least steadfast among them brought themselves to purchase such instruction as grammar schools could give them by the formal rejection of all the specially Talmudic doctrines, and the adoption of the faith of the sect of Karaim, who in Russia enjoy privileges that are denied the Talmudists. Thus a number of young men in the Crimea, after much inner struggling and hesitation, resolved to stifle their scruples and take this doubtful course; but they had first to petition the Minister of the Interior (an Atheist, as it chanced) for permission to take the fateful step. They were soon made aware, however, that they were asking for the moon; the heavens and the earth may pass away, but no Russian Jew can ever abjure his faith in order to become a member of the Karaim sect—for a law of Catherine II. forbids it. There was now only one other way to obtain the coveted boon, namely by stealth, and this case has also been thoughtfully provided for by the wise legislator, who decreed that those Jewish parents who, on sending their children to school, neglect to make declaration that they are Jews, will be subjected to exactly the same punishment as if they were convicted of—forgery.† This sounds somewhat harsh to Englishmen; it may also seem strange to logicians and legislators of every nation; but the Jews feel that they have reason to be thankful for the leniency that refrained in such cases from treating them as incendiaries or regicides.

The Hebrew people in Russia are characterised by an insatiable thirst for such education as can be had in that country; it would seem to partake of the nature of a passion that grows with their growth, gaining strength from the very opposition it encounters.‡ The Government, on the

other hand, is firmly resolved to starve it out and to thrust the Jews back to ignorance, blind obedience, and the Pale. And this is perfectly natural; if it seems immoral, it is only to those English Russophiles with whom fanaticism is the sole substitute for knowledge, and who damage the cause they would further by judging such acts by a European standard of morality—a mistake which no Russian statesman will ever commit. The reasons that make a dispassionate observer look upon the present persecution of five or six million Jews as natural are not far to seek: they are all comprised in the one principle of self-preservation applied by a people which is standing on a much lower moral and intellectual level than the bulk of Europeans.

An autocracy may at times be quite as good and wise a government as a republic or a constitutional monarchy, and no honest student of history, whatever political opinions he may profess, can withhold his admiration from men like Oliver Cromwell, or even Dr. Francia. But the autocracy of Russia, in which tens of thousands of irresponsible tsarlets devour, like human locusts, all the material and moral resources of the people, is a foul stain on modern Europe, which only crime can perpetuate and human blood wash away. The logical correlative of such rulers is an ignorant, broken-spirited, shiftless people; and the rulers are resolved to keep the bulk of Russians ignorant, broken-spirited, and shiftless, on the principle that he who wishes for eggs must put up with the cackling of hens—*qui vult finem vult media*. This is the key to that series of oppressive laws enacted during the past five years, the undisguised object of which is to deprive the masses not only of what is usually termed education, but of all kind of instruction whatever. The results obtained up to the present moment are magnificent or disastrous, according to the angle of vision from which we view them; the bulk of the Russian people are disgustingly servile, incredibly superstitious, hopelessly shiftless and improvident, the natural prey of every passing quack or impostor, and the power of the Tsar is proportionately strengthened.* The semi-official journal of

percentage of Russian children in the higher educational establishments of the empire was twenty-two in ten thousand, whereas the percentage of Jewish children amounted to forty-eight in ten thousand.

* To give a case in point, the *Norovye Fremya*, describing how the Jews of the district of Starokonstantinovsk return to hamlets and villages in which they are forbidden to reside, almost as fast as they are driven out, adds: "The Russian peasantry, instead of assisting the police to expel them, do just the reverse—harbour and screen them from justice, and when interrogated deny that the Jews in question live there, and assert that they have only come on a visit. A Jew has only to buy a glass of vodka and promise a trifle besides, and for this Russian peasants will, almost without exception, lie

* Ministerial Circular, No. 7, of the year 1888.

† Collection of Laws, vol. ix, art. 968.

‡ According to the statistics collected by the Ministry of Public Instruction before the introduction of the measures forbidding Jews to educate their children (1885-6), the per-

the capital describes the Russians as "a people run wild, savage, supine. The judges and crown lawyers of the empire," it adds, "can testify that the number of words in use among the Russian peasantry does not exceed from one to two hundred. Even the Kirgheez nomads, with their wonderful memory, foresight, imagination, and shiftiness, stand on a far higher level than our Russian peasantry."* Over against these "country louts" stand the Jews with wits sharpened by necessity and appetites whetted by gnawing hunger—"like ravenous wolves beside appetising sheep," as an official organ once described them. And the Russian Government is engaged in solving the problem how to keep them together in a state of semi-starvation without a catastrophe. Blinding the wolves is the latest solution that seems to have suggested itself, and, on the principle of self-preservation, why, it may be asked, should Russian statesmen not give it a trial?

Naturally, much more is hereby implied than deprivation of mere lay instruction. The Talmudic religion, whatever else may be said about it, is in itself a course of mental training capable of rendering the mental powers as supple and sharp as would a course of mathematics or of German metaphysics. And as long as a Jew is allowed to remain a Jew he will continue to be infinitely better equipped for the battle of life than the best of his Russian competitors. Hence the natural desire of the more far-

seeing among Russian politicians to extirpate Judaism, root and branch; hence the feverish efforts now being made to realise that scheme by employing every known form of injustice and violence that stops short of death.

Every sordid motive that a legislator well versed in this lower branch of his profession could suggest is put before the Jew to induce him to abandon the faith of his forefathers, without replacing it by anything better. Privileges denied his brethren, money and its various equivalents, even the hope of unlawful plunder, have been deliberately relied upon by these champions of Christianity to tempt the Hebrew to please his Emperor by denying his God. Imagine one of those lean, cadaverous caricatures of humanity who crowd the cities of the Pale, and whose existence under the actual circumstances is a stronger argument against Russian Christianity than any that could be drawn from the writings of Strauss or Huxley; and suppose that accident or design puts it in his power to defraud a wealthy co-religionist, by abuse of confidence, fraud, or downright robbery. He succumbs to the temptation, beggars his brother, and immediately becomes a member of the Orthodox Church, as a sort of corollary. His victim prosecutes him and summons a cloud of credible, respectable witnesses who can prove the charge to the satisfaction of the most sceptical. He, on his side, suborns two or three abandoned Christian wretches, whose life is one coarse libel on Christianity. The case comes on for trial, and the Russian courts, guided by Article 330 of the Tenth Volume of Laws, will refuse to allow the Jewish witnesses to depose against the defendant, because they are naturally supposed to bear a grudge against an apostate; and the light-hearted perjury of the Orthodox Christians (which costs, as we have seen, but a small measure of *vodka*) sets the seal of legality on crimes that would send their author into penal servitude in England. Of course, there is one way out of the difficulty: the plaintiff may go to work and bribe his witnesses to commit perjury too, *i.e.*, to embrace Christianity, which they hate, and then their testimony will be received with credence and respect. For when a Jew finds the truth, supposing that truth to be the "orthodox" faith, he is caressed and made much of for the time being; the law requires "that he be baptised only in a city church, and on a Sunday or festival, and with all possible pomp and ceremony."* If he be married he

when questioned in a court of justice—ay, lie in the most effrontery way conceivable, even though, as is often the case, they are giving evidence upon oath."—*Noroye Vremya*, 4th April, 1890. None of the conflicting conclusions which can be drawn from this unanswerable and lamentable fact are of good omen for the speedy settlement of the Jewish question in Russia.

* *Grashdanin*, 19th January, 1890. Cf. also *Noroye*, 20th January, 1890. An English Russophile organ which might possibly render some services to its Tsar by courageous honesty which it can never effect by mere coarse flattery, *a tort et à travers*, recently alluding to a former paper of this series, the statements of which it completely garbles, seriously puts forward the following argument: "If the Russian people are such ignorant, shiftless loons as they are represented to be, they are sorely in need of an autocratic government that will protect them against their own instincts; if they are enlightened, moral, well-behaved, autocracy is likewise the best government for them, for they would otherwise have long ago cried out against its existence. "If the books are in accordance with the teachings of the Koran," said the fanatic Caliph, of the Alexandrian library, "they are needless, and must be burned: If opposed to the Koran, they are heretical, and must be destroyed forthwith." The accusation brought against the Russian Government, and demonstrated by unanswerable facts, is that they are deliberately demoralizing the wretched people in order to perpetuate the chaotic misrule on which they are thriving. What would any honest, unprejudiced Englishman say to the following candid avowal of the Government's programme, made by the aristocratic organ subsidized by the Government: "The Russian peasant possesses great powers of endurance and remarkable patience. And these, in sum, are the qualities of the Russian which should form the basis of the relations of persons in authority to the peasants; and it must be admitted that the authorities have to deal with a soil very favourable if it is only ploughed and harrowed intelligently."—*Grashdanin*, 2nd January, 1890. If this be not Machiavellism, its defence in an English periodical is disinterested love of the good, the beautiful, and the true.

* Supplement to article 76 (section 5).

must either divorce his wife or compel her too to subordinate her religious convictions to her conjugal affection; and if she refuses to become a Christian, neither herself nor her Christian husband will be permitted to leave the Pale.* Finally, in order to contribute to the sacredness of the family, which, Russians complain, is lacking among the Jews, the new laws give a Jewish boy or girl the right and the encouragement to abandon the faith of his fathers without consulting his parents.† The difficulties thrown in the way of opening synagogues and prayer-houses are as numerous and as prohibitive as those which have been so effectually opposed to opening of schools, and the Rabbis of those that already exist are harassed and persecuted till they resign or go over to the enemy. In one place the ministry refuses to confirm the election of a respected Rabbi, conducted in strict accordance with all the laws and regulations, simply because, penetrated with a deep sense of his moral responsibility, he refuses to prostitute a religious office to the desires of political Chauvinists, and they unceremoniously put in his place an upstart who was not disliked only by those who did not know him. The Jews of Yekaterinburg, who had lived there for generations, summoned up courage once to ask permission to have, not a synagogue, but merely a house of prayer.‡ The Government, in reply, very quickly discovered a long-forgotten ukase, which absolutely forbids Jews to reside in that city, or in any part of the Ural, and they are now about to be dragged thousands of miles to the Pale, which many of them have never seen before. In the village of Kakhovka the Hebrew community was lately summoned to appear before the new police superintendent, who at once informed them that he had orders to close up and seal their prayer-house, and to bring them up to trial for having four years ago opened one, "and for having frequently

prayed therein," without being authorised to do so by the Government.

These are some of the measures which have driven thousands of Jews to apostatise; and one reads very frequently in the Russian newspapers of "sixty young Jews who, desirous of entering the university, have abjured the Law of Moses"; of forty others who became Christians because their business called them outside of the Pale, and scores of others who for equally valid reasons are introduced every month into the true fold, where they are as much in their place as eagles in a barnyard. Any one of the measures employed against the Jews would be enough to "convert" three-fourths of the Christians of Russia to Shamanism or Bouddism in a week; and the circumstance that about six million persecuted and miserable wretches remain steadfastly faithful to a religion that causes their life to be changed into a fiery furnace without the angel to keep it cool, is the nearest approach to a grandiose miracle that has been vouchsafed to this unbelieving generation. The Orthodox Church cannot be congratulated on these wedding guests whom it is daily picking up in the highways and byways, and bidding, or rather driving, into the spiritual banqueting hall. Not only is one prepared for the discovery that they are not provided with the indispensable wedding garment, but one cannot affect surprise to learn that such raiment as they have is swarming with disease germs which will do dire execution on the assembled guests. I have conversed with numbers of "converted" Jews of all classes of society, and I can affirm that, with few exceptions, not only have they not the faintest glimmer of faith in Christianity, but they hate the very name, despise its priests, sneer at its ceremonies, and loathe themselves for perjuring their souls by receiving its sacraments and praising the name of its founder. And they bring up their sons and daughters in the same sentiments. I know a respectable family in Moscow, the father of which was "converted" like thousands of his co-religionists, and I can answer for it that not one of his sons or daughters had a shred of belief in God or devil, their religious faith being summed up in the one conviction that the Orthodox Church is deserving of the intense hatred of every honest man and woman, and that no opportunity should ever be missed of contributing to its ruin.

Some of these "converts" repent of what they have done, secretly do penance for their sin, and return to the synagogue. But their sighs and tears are as unavailing

* Complete Coll. of Laws, vol. x., part I., art. 81.
† *Ibid.*, section 3.
‡ The abject fear which the Jews have of displeasing the authorities exceeds belief. Take, for instance, a man in the position of Baron Ginsburg, of St. Petersburg, a millionaire and a baron of the Russian empire, who might well venture to undertake much that is forbidden to his poorer brethren; and yet he is mortally afraid of saying, or doing, or leaving unsaid and undone anything that might possibly offend even a petty Russian official. He dares not speak even in favour of the Russian Government, lest that should seem an attempt on his part to patronize; and he would as soon cut his tongue out as say a word against it. A few years ago he caused all the Russian laws concerning the Jews to be printed in one volume at his expense; but when the work was done he reflected that his motives might be misinterpreted, so he withdrew it from circulation; and no entreaties on the part of his own intimate friends could persuade him to give away one of the thousands of copies that were lying on the shelves of his library. In Odessa, where the governor is Judophobe and something more, a Jew will soon be afraid to sneeze in the street.

as those of their forefathers who, sitting down by the waters of Babylon, wept as they remembered Sion; no Rabbi would dare give them help or advice, much less admission to the community; he would forfeit his position if he did. One of these poor wretches, Fichtenstein by name, a venerable old man of sixty, was induced in a moment of weakness to "embrace Christianity," for which he afterwards did penance, literally in sackcloth and ashes. He visited the synagogue as often as he could, where his fervent, tearful prayers attracted the attention of the congregation. The authorities set a watch on his movements, acquired the conviction that he did really pray in the Jewish place of worship, and had him straightway arrested and sent for trial. The example of these men, it is complained, does not tend to raise the moral level of the Russian Church; "they scatter the seeds of infidelity and insubordination—religious, political, and social—broadcast throughout the country," say the astonished spiritual and civil authorities, "and the harm thus done is incalculable." Harm it may be; incalculable, however, it certainly is not. The Jews may all of them in time be brought to "embrace Russian Christianity," as the Moorish chieftain Almanzor embraced his Christian enemies; and in both cases the embrace is pestilential, deadly.

But the written laws against the Jews, severe as they undoubtedly are, can give no idea of the actual amount and kind of suffering inflicted on this unfortunate people by those who administer them, and from whose interpretation and conduct there lies no appeal. Not only must one take into consideration the kind of whip with which they are beaten, but likewise the arm that wields it; and in this case it is the sinewy, bloody arm that knouted so many Christians to death. For some officials the Jews exist as a fertile source of revenue—a god-send to be grateful for—the bribes they are compelled annually to pay exceeding by a large amount the total of their double annual taxes. This state of things reminds one of our own Henry III. pledging all the Jews of his kingdom to his brother for the loan of a considerable sum of money, authorising him in return to keep them in his power until they paid the debt to the last farthing. Russia's solution of the Jewish problem has not advanced beyond that stage yet. Here is what one of the most trustworthy and impartial newspapers of Russia has to say on the subject:—

"The restrictions laid upon the Jews serve in

reality as an unfailing and inexhaustible source of income to the authorities charged with their execution; all those Jews whose rights are more or less doubtful manage to get them changed into undoubted rights by the payment of uninterrupted blackmail; *battues* and domiciliary visits, which assume the most improbable forms, also wind up with a money tribute. Thus on a dark night, when profound silence reigns everywhere—usually a Friday night is chosen, when every Jew is at home—suddenly the Jewish quarter of the city is surrounded by a cordon, and a great multitude of people, men, women, and children, old men—nay, often even the sick—are arrested and packed off to the police station; here, for lack of room, they are kept all night in the courtyard in the open air, no matter how severe the cold may be, no matter how inclement the weather. These are facts."*

And facts, I may add, that are related not of last century, nor last year, but last winter.

This hunting of Jews who are living where they have no right to reside, whose passports have expired, who have transacted some business which their faith disqualifies them from transacting, or who are working hard to keep body and soul together in a position which they are not allowed to occupy, has now become an every-day occurrence, that no longer excites surprise and seldom even evokes compassion. The newspapers chronicle these things with as perfect indifference as a huxter's change of residence. "The authorities have ordered the assistant notaries who belong to the Hebrew persuasion to be immediately dismissed from their situations in Kovno," says the *Warsaw Courier*, and people read and pass on phlegmatically to the next item of intelligence. "M. Akimoff, the President of the Divisional Court," says another paper, "has informed all notaries that they must dismiss their clerks who are members of the Jewish communion, and fill up their places with Russians."† And people yawn and read on.

The suffering inflicted by this wholesale proscription of the Jews is intensified a hundred-fold by the wantonly savage manner in which it is carried out, the victims being treated in many cases exactly as if, instead of human beings, they were brute beasts, who might be chased without impropriety in the fields and highways, and tied up in an outhouse, when caught, till they could be conveniently whipped or physicked. The following incident will illustrate my meaning: A considerable number of Jews repair every year from various parts of Russia to the Liman in Odessa, to test the medicinal virtue of the waters, which are strongly recommended by Russian doctors

* *The Week* (Nedaylya), 7th September, 1890.
† *Odessa News*, October, 1886.

in cases of rheumatism, gout, scrofula, skin diseases, paralysis, etc. Numerous petitions, stamped with revenue stamps, certificates, and documents of all kinds have to be drawn up, presented, and verified before a Jew can receive his double passport and permission to pass a few weeks at the waters of the Liman. And when he has passed through this wearisome and expensive ordeal and has begun the cure, he is not even then free from persecution. He or she may, at any time of the day or night, be pounced upon by the police, snatched up, ladies as well as men, and ignominiously subjected to a medical examination and pronounced impostors who are at the waters under false pretences, having none of the disorders which the latter are supposed to cure. No farther back than the month of July, the Jewish ladies and gentlemen who were using the waters of the Andreieff Liman in Odessa, were thus unceremoniously arrested one day—night is usually the favorite time for arrests, domiciliary visits, &c., in Russia—and marched off to the city doctor, who was commanded to examine them thoroughly, and to find out whether they were really suffering from the diseases for which they were being treated, or had merely come for their pleasure! It is no easy matter even for a physician to decide in the twinkling of an eye, so to say, whether a man has or has not rheumatism, gout, tic, scrofula, &c., &c. The Odessa doctor, however, knew exactly what was required of him, and justified the confidence with which he was honoured: he declared that two-thirds of the entire number of Jews were in good health and had no need of the Liman waters. Even if this were demonstrably true, the services of these persons might be desirable or even indispensable to their invalid relatives, and on this ground their presence might have been tolerated; but the authorities sent them home at once.*

It is no light matter for the Jews, who, after all, are mere human beings, to make a stand against a powerful government which is mobilizing its numerous army of officials, employing all its pecuniary resources, and all the ingenuity of human hate to crush them out of existence. Still they cannot—on the whole—be accused of not doing their best to dispute every inch of ground, of not struggling for some few of the rights of men, when possible, on a strictly legal basis. No losing game—with stakes so high—was ever yet played with such unflinching spirit.

No fox hotly pursued by eager hounds and joyful huntsmen ever employed more profound cunning, more suppleness, more talent for adapting, on the spur of the moment, all the rapidly changing circumstances of time, place, and persons to the main end in view, than the Jews. The tragi-comic element that results from this pitting of intellect against brute force, the adventures, curious escapes, the plots and counterplots, would, if properly treated, make a most entertaining volume—but entertaining as were the jokes and puns and witty remarks made at the gladiator fights in Rome, and which drew their point from their contrast to the human being grimly fighting on the threshold of eternity, to prolong for a few minutes the brutal pleasure of a jaded rabble.

The laws that regulate the military service of the Jews are characterised by their Draconian severity. Most of the alleviations and privileges accorded to Christians, and which tend so visibly to promote good feeling between the men and their superiors, are inexorably denied them, and the hardships inseparable from life in the barracks, with its long winter night-watches and exhausting summer manœuvres, are needlessly made unendurable to the soldier who keeps holy the Sabbath. A Jew can never become an officer as a Christian can—nay, as even a Mohammedan can, who is not disqualified from the highest position in the military hierarchy, filling offices of trust and responsibility. This is a remarkable—it seems an unjust—restriction; but the Jew, hardened by use and want, is prepared for it. But why go still further and allow every soldier who calls himself a Christian, a Mohammedan, or a Buddhist to lord it over him, and not only hector and bully, but assault him with absolute impunity, sometimes with direct approbation? The paralysing fear of encountering these untold miseries of soldier life, from which the only escape is suicide, accounts for the deep-rooted aversion which many Jews manifest to don the livery of the Czar, and the desperate attempts they make to escape from serving in the army. Hundreds of mothers secretly leave their native places before the birth of their children, which, when the children are boys, they refuse to register, thus placing their innocent offspring, almost from the moment of its birth, in a position bristling with still greater difficulties, with more terrible hardships than the one they so greatly dread.*

* "My attention was drawn to the strange fact of the virtual cessation of male births among the Jews, as if by common accord all Jewish women had resolved to put an end to the

* *Novoye Vremya*, 23rd July, 1890.

It is impossible for a Jew to do anything in a simple, straightforward manner. He could not even if he would; he sets to work to carry out the most commonplace and lawful business transaction just as if his negotiations were but a blind to mask some hidden design, the nature of which you have no means of guessing—it may be to rob you, it may be to murder you. All his dealings are fenced and hedged round with so many provisos and conditions and contingent obligations, that a very experienced lawyer would have no light task if he were set to unravel the web. The following is a very typical instance of the trouble taken by Jews to wrest to their own benefit one of the laws framed for their ruin. Intending to conclude a business arrangement, whatever its nature may be, the validity of which may hereafter be called in question by the other party to the contract, a Jew first makes a pretence of lending him some costly furniture or delivering valuable goods—which he himself never had to give or lend—and then sues him for the value. The case comes on for trial (the Russian law courts are literally clogged with such fictitious lawsuits, which prevent the hearing of really important actions); both parties are heard with all the conscious seriousness and dignified leisure which befits a Russian judge. The defendant seems to make a determined stand, but loses his case and is condemned to pay the sum demanded. Now this is exactly the sum that would represent the plaintiff's loss, *if* at any future time the defendant should call in question the validity of the contract which they have *not yet concluded*. He would then claim a writ of execution to recover the sum adjudged him by the court.*

Formerly a Jew could lend money on landed securities. Now this is absolutely forbidden; so, before advancing the sum demanded, he requires the borrower to give him a note of hand for the capital and the interest combined, he next sues him for the amount, and when judgment is given in his favour, advances the sum of money required. Or, suppose a merchant or petty trader has business in some town or city which his quality of Jew precludes him from visiting. If he petitions the authorities to allow him to go there and spend a

week or a fortnight, he is insulted for his pains. Instead of this, however, two of his friends or dependents quarrel and summon him to give evidence before the local magistrate, which he does; but one of the parties appeals to the higher court, which sits in the city he is so desirous of visiting, and he is again called upon to give evidence, this time on oath. This also he does, if it is a criminal prosecution, as it probably would be, at the cost of the crown. One of the litigants is perhaps condemned, but the prosecutor thereupon generously forgives him, and all parties are satisfied. The law courts of the west of Russia are positively brought to a standstill by the overwhelming number of fictitious actions of this kind entered by Jews, who thus compel the imperial judges to spend their time and labour and the resources of the State in assisting the Jewish community to evade the very laws which they are sworn to administer.* A more ludicrous sight was never witnessed in the law courts of modern times. "Lately the local authorities," a Kieff journal announces,

"set about verifying the right of the Jews in Shmerinka to reside there. Many of them were living in little huts of their own. Before the verification took place, however, many of the resident Hebrews deemed it advisable to flee. There are several hundred Jewish houses there, the majority of which were erected, like the palaces of the fairy tales, by night. The work was done in the daytime in bits and scraps, at some distance from the city, and when ready the complete house would be drawn by twenty or thirty pairs of oxen, and set up in the place destined for it. For convenience' sake these houses were made to move about on wheels."†

The poverty of the greater part of the six million Jews who are caged up in the few plague-stricken towns and villages of the Pale surpasses that which excited such a cry of horror in London when the sweating system and its results were dragged into the light of day. The late Minister of Finances, Reutern, declared candidly in a memoir to the Emperor, that "the poverty in which the Jews live is extreme, and the extraordinary demoralisation of the Hebrew race in Russia is mainly the outcome of the extremely unfavorable conditions in which they are placed for gaining a livelihood."‡ The amount of taxes which they owe is enormous.§ It was shown by the census that whereas the average proportion of Christians to the total number of houses owned by Christians in the governments of

tribe of Israel. From private sources, however, I learned that thence were pretty much as they had always been, but that the far-seeing, provident parents refused to register their births, in order to free them from the necessity, many years thence, of serving in the army."—*The Vinea Messenger*, 11th December, 1887.

* *Noroye Vremya*, 24th December, 1880. These artifices are rendered possible by the important circumstance that in Russia law is not costly, and a man can and generally does conduct his own case, even if he is unable to read or write.

* *Noroye Vremya*, 24th December, 1880.

† Cf. also *Noroye Vremya*, 10th January, 1880.

‡ Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, vol. xl., 42364.

§ *Noroye Vremya*, 10th January, 1880.

the Pale, is between 410 and 510 persons to one house, the average number of Jews is 1,229.* In most parts of the Pale, they are cooped up like insects or animals rather than men. In Berditscheff, the official statistician tells us

"the Jews are huddled together more like salted herrings than human beings; tens of thousands of them are devoid of any constant means of subsistence, living from hand to mouth; several families are often crowded into one or two rooms of a dilapidated hut, so that at night there is absolutely no space whatever between the sleepers. . . . The lodgers turn these rooms into workshops in the daytime, refining wax therein, making tallow candles, tanning leather, &c.; here whole families live, work, sleep and eat together, in that fetid atmosphere, with their tools and materials lying around on all sides."†

The *Moscow Gazette*, describing the state of the Jews in Berditscheff, says:

"The streets of the Jewish quarter of the town are not more than four feet wide; on either side of them the tumble-down old houses seem ready to fall to pieces; children are lying before the houses on the street in a state of almost complete nudity, wallowing in the slough, and among them numbers of slovenly women—the mothers of the children—also stretched out sideways and lengthways on the street, sleeping under the rays of the burning sun."

The statistician, M. Bobrovski, writing on the condition of the Jews in the government of Grodno, says:

"By far the greater part of the Jewish population are poor and are always engrossed by the one care: how to get their daily bread. Burdened with numerous families, the crowded state in which they live surpasses anything one can conceive as possible. Frequently one hut consisting of three or at most four rooms lodges as many as twelve families, whose lives are an unbroken series of privations and pains. Whole families sometimes live on three-quarters of a pound of bread, one salt herring, and a few onions."‡

"In the Government of Kovno,"—and in every government inhabited by the Jews—"there are families who never break their fast till night, and then only if the father and bread-winner had found work to do and has received his wage."§

This, no doubt, is very unsavoury reading, and I inflict as little of it upon my readers as will barely suffice to enable them to form an opinion upon the Jewish question in Russia. Russian Judophobes—many members of the Government included—positively take a pleasure in these disgusting things. And yet what the object of all this persecution is—beyond the one I have

already suggested—no man can tell. It is not the Jewish religion that is so unrelentingly pursued, for it is admitted even by the Orthodox Church to be superior to Mohammedanism, which enjoys toleration in Russia. Neither is it the Jewish race, for once a Jew adopts Christianity as his "faith," he is placed on a level with born Christians. It cannot be the supposed economical influence for evil exerted by the Jews, for the same evils complained of, only in much larger dimensions, are to be found in those parts of the Empire in which a Jew never sets foot. And yet, objectless as this persecution evidently is from any reasonable point of view, not only is it warmly advocated by a portion of the press, but a fiendish delight is taken in contemplating the results. The following is a short extract from a description of Vilna, published in the *Vilna Messenger*, a Government organ, and quoted with relish by the *Novoye Vremya*:—

"All the narratives of travellers about Asiatic and African cities dwindle down to the level of the commonplace in comparison with the sights that meet your eye here; even the glorious city of Berditscheff, the very name of which is become proverbial as a synonym for dirt and rottenness, is as nothing when confronted with this pearl. . . . Glance at the Jewish Synagogue. The dirt in the courtyard is indescribable, the noise and tumult like unto that which accompanied the confusion of tongues. But the atmosphere! You should breathe it, to be able to conceive what it is like. Beside the women's wing of the synagogue are the baths in which the sons and daughters of Israel cleanse their sinful flesh. You can judge of the internal tidiness and cleanliness of these baths by the high dunghill carefully heaped up beside the steps of the entrance."*

But the rest of this foul essay is, at least in parts, too filthy to be given in English. Imagine the Nawab of Bengal sneering at Mr. Holwell and his twenty-two companions for the mephitic atmosphere of the Black Hole of Calcutta, and you have a parallel to the good taste and humanity of Russian Judophobes.

It would be asking for a miracle to expect that men condemned, as are the Russian Jews, to rot away in forced idleness, in Augean filth, breathing air poisoned by the smell of untanned leather, and charged with the noisome exhalations of the dead and dying, to be clean, or even to be merely dirty in the ordinary acceptation of the word. What a harrowing picture of their life does not the following scene conjure up—one of the most pathetic of the tragicomic incidents to which I alluded above? In the middle of the town of Berditscheff

* Shooravski Statist., *Description of the Government of Kieff*, vol. I., p. 247.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Description of the Government of Grodno*, vol. i., p. 858 and fol.

§ Afanassieff, *Description of the Government of Kovno*, pp. 582, 583.

* *Novoye Vremya*, 29th August, 1888.

there is a large channel or sink in which is thrown all kinds of foul unnameable filth. One day it occurred to a police superintendent that he might have it cleaned out gratis, and he hit upon the following happy expedient: Strolling along the edge of this putrid cesspool, he suddenly stood still and then bent anxiously over the brink, stirring up the filth with his stick. A crowd of Jews soon gathered round him, and inquired what was wrong. He replied that he had dropped a valuable ring worth £25 into the *cloaca*, and he promised a reward to the finder. "In about fifteen minutes," says the journal, "all this putrescent garbage was taken out in handkerchiefs, buckets, pots, rags, &c., and brought home by the Jews, who scrutinised it in their courtyards, each one hopeful of finding the ring. And in this way," it concludes, "the superintendent succeeded in *cleansing that canal*." What extraordinary notions the Russian police must have of the meaning of the word sanitation!

The majority of the other charges brought against the Jews are in equal good taste. In fairness to both parties, however, it must be admitted that from one fault—or perhaps the word crime would more accurately connote it—it would be difficult to exculpate them; and this partly explains, if it does not justify, the indignation of the Russian Government. I allude to a lack of ardour, amounting at times to a positive aversion on their part, to risk their lives in the service of the Tsar, in return for the rights and protection which they enjoy in Russia. And this, in spite of the solemn oath which they all have to take, "in all things to serve and obey his Imperial Majesty, not sparing in his service my life-blood, but shedding it, ay, to the last drop,"* in defence of throne and beloved fatherland. This may be perjury and high treason, combined, but, whatever its name and degree, many Jews† are guilty of it. And if that be a satisfactory answer to the charge of undue harshness brought against the Russian Government, there is an end to the matter. At the same time one fails to understand why the Government, which taunts the Jews with being cowards, takes more pains to draw or drive them into the Russian army than if they were so many Hector and Achilles. Lest a Jew follow what is supposed to be the bent of his inclination and shirk his "sacred duty to his Little Father the Tsar and his dear Father-

land," his personal appearance must be minutely described in his passport in much greater detail than if he were a Christian. Thus every pimple, mole, malformation, and other mark by which he may be identified is to be clearly mentioned!‡ If the medical commission declare him unfit for service, and the authorities entertain a well-founded or absurd suspicion that he himself deliberately contributed to bring about this unfitness, he is received into the army in spite of his physical defects, and told off for special service.† If, when called upon, a Jew fails to present himself to the military commission whose business it is to accept or reject him, he is not imprisoned, for this would be no punishment to a man whose life is a crownless martyrdom, but heavily fined. This may be a just and certain method of engrafting that love of Fatherland and Little Father which neither their feelings nor their reason have been able to evoke, but it seems needlessly harsh to inflict upon the hard-working old parents of the defaulter a fine of £50 besides: and this is exactly what the law does.‡ But many young men are orphans at this age, or their parents are literally beggars, so that, not possessing a copper coin, they have no fear of the penalties. Such youths ingeniously turn the law to account, and compel it to yield them and their relations a slight profit. They run away from the parish or city in which the commission holds its sittings, and are declared fugitives. For all such deserters—if only they be Jews—a reward of fifty roubles is always liberally paid. A friend of the runaway is informed by the delinquent himself of his whereabouts, he communicates the information to the authorities and receives the reward, which he gives in part or in its entirety to the offender.

In this manner many of the Russian laws against the Jewish population either defeat their own purpose or inflict considerable loss upon the Christian subjects of the Tsar. Thus there are numerous districts in Russia—fertile stretches of land which are in sore need of workmen to till the soil or reap its fruits. It often happens that the corn rots on the ground for want of hands to cut it. The landowners have been for years crying out for some measure calculated to restore what the emancipation of the serfs deprived them of—cheap labour; and the Government did enact a law a few years ago, which has created a class of agricultural labourers who sell themselves for

* Supplement to art. 1061 (1886).

† The percentage of Jews who neglect to present themselves for military service, or afterwards desert, is larger than that of the Christians; but the difference is not considerable.

• Military Law of 1886. Explanation of Article 8.

† Explanation of Article 40.

‡ Article 350 of the Military Law.

several years, and even descend to the heirs of their master, should he die before the expiration of their term. But this measure has not brought the looked-for relief to Russian landowners, who are often driven to despair at the sight of their riches melting away like snow for want of labourers, while the miserable Jews are perishing of sheer starvation, almost devouring each other, like Ugolino's offspring in the tower of the Gualandi, because there is no work for them to do in the Pale. These hungry wretches are then accused by sleek, over-fed ministers in their warm drawing-rooms, of a disposition to outreach the Russian peasant whenever they have a chance. The accusation, it is to be feared, is not wholly groundless, for Jews belong to the genus animal no less than to the species man, and the instinct of self-preservation is as strongly developed within him when their rival is a Russian as if he were only a vile Jew, like themselves. Men of mild, amiable disposition, tossed about in an open boat on the ocean for a week or ten days, and tortured by the pangs of hunger and thirst, have even been known to harbour wicked thoughts of cannibalism, which the children of Israel in Russia have not yet been known to entertain.

I am personally acquainted with a rich Jew in a flourishing provincial city who is compelled to pay in bribes to the authorities a sum that would support half the Jews of Berditscheff. He raises the necessary amount by imposing an illegal supplementary tax on all *kosher* food sold by him to his co-religionists. His arrangements with the police enable him not only to do this with impunity, but likewise to have all his competitors removed from the city "administratively," that is, by an order issued by the police, without rhyme or reason. These "administrative" orders are much more demoralising than the *lettres de cachet* of the French monarchy, because much more easily obtained. If a Christian have an obliging friend in the police administration, he can treat many Jews of the lower classes just as if they were serfs. I knew a respectable young girl of very honest parents privileged to live in one of the capital cities. A Christian "fell in love" with her, and under pretext of giving her lessons and preparing her for admission to one of the high schools, seduced her, solemnly promising marriage. I heard her once ask him to marry her, and I also heard him reply that he would have her sent out of the city in twenty-four hours for her presumption. And he did. A cousin of his is serving in

the police department, and he had no difficulty to obtain an order for her banishment "as a disorderly Jewess." "But how could you bring yourself to do such a damnable act?" I asked. "Oh, she is only a Jewess," he answered. "What else is she good for? Besides, everybody does the same."*

Yes; everybody does the same, and the lives of six million people whose instincts, aptitudes, and moral sense place them on a much higher level than their Christian fellow subjects, are thus made literally unendurable. Scoffed at, terrorised, and robbed by every petty official with that certain impunity which invites to crime; insulted, beaten, and kept in constant fear of violence by a vile rabble whom they dare not irritate by even a slight success in business or trade, held up to the scorn and indignation of all Russia by the Governmental press as the authors of every calamity avoidable and unavoidable; education and instruction denied them, the learned professions and higher branch of the profession of arms closed to them; trade and commerce rendered very difficult by intolerable taxes and endless restrictions, and *wholly impossible without bribery and fraud*; their personal liberty now at last completely taken away from them; their religion proscribed, and their very souls killed by the perjury with which they are forced to blacken it, Russian Jews may well defy their persecutors to frame any further laws calculated to make their position worse than it is.

Surely English journalists and politicians carried distrust too far when they doubted the solemn assurances of the Russian Government that no more stringent laws were in contemplation at present, just as the American coroner's jury, finding a paper with the words, "I have killed myself," on the corpse of an inveterate liar, brought in a verdict that he was not dead at all. Still, it is to be regretted that the monster meeting which the Lord Mayor of London was to have convened was not held, as it might have led to some beneficial results; not, of course, by passing impotent resolutions of indignation, which would have had as much effect on the Russian Government as dew-

* At present a Jew can be sent out of the city on the ground that he has been *impolite* in the street or in a crowd. And this law has been made by a Governor whose politeness is shown by kicks and cuffs and blasphemous oaths, as the whole south of Russia is well aware.

+ Cf. *Noroye Vremya*, which published a long article at the time of the accident to the Tsar's train at Borik to show that the danger of sudden death had been brought about by the Jews, while his escape was miraculous and actually foretold by one of the minor Hebrew prophets, who, when read aright, mentions him by name. This same enlightened organ, the most extensively circulated in Russia, also countenanced the fable that the Jews periodically murder a Christian child, whose blood they require for their ceremonies.

drops on a goose's back, but by respectfully petitioning his Imperial Majesty—as a daily paper lately suggested—to commute in his clemency the present unbearable sufferings to which the law condemns six millions of men and women for worshipping God as Christ did—for painless death by electricity or poison.

DR. LIDDON.

From *The Guardian* (Church of England), London, September 17, 1890.

It is not granted to many men to be both widely famous and widely loved; to wield great power in their public work, and in private life to go on winning to themselves a host of friends among those with whom in any way they have to do. But when it was known eight days ago that Dr. Liddon was dead, there were probably hundreds of people, in all classes of society, on whom, before they could think of the fact that the most remarkable preacher of the English Church would be heard no more, there came a keen and haunting sense of personal impoverishment. That sense reached far beyond the circle of Dr. Liddon's acquaintance. For many a man, whose name, perhaps, he never knew, will for years to come recall the figure that was so well known in London and on the country roads round Oxford; and will think how strangely near he seemed to have been drawn to the great Canon of St. Paul's by a kindly nod and a smile of sheer good will, by a few words of unreasonable gratitude for some little service or courtesy, or by the rendering of quiet and generous help in some time of anxiety and sorrow. The Church of England loses, at a time of grave and manifold anxiety, one who would have feared nothing and grudged nothing in her service; but there are very many, rich and poor, who would have to own that what they felt most vividly last week was that they could never hear again that voice, never see that face, which always brought to them the certainty that there was some one who would be glad to help them if he could.

The fame, for which Dr. Liddon cared so little, and the love, for which he cared so much, both came to him for the same reason. Both were won by the same union in him of characteristics seldom found together—the union of a very fine intellect with a very simple heart. On the one hand, were abilities and acquisitions such as few in Europe could surpass; on the other hand,

ordering all these about with a secure, habitual authority, was a very plain motive, which any Christian man might understand. Those who had known him well for many years would often find themselves startled, almost as strangers might be, by the swiftness and splendour of his intellect; but the care he had at heart always was the same, and sometimes was as naively obvious as a child's. The ever-ready penetration which rushed through all that was wrapped round the central quality of a remark, an action, or a book; the power of utterance, as finished and brilliant in its lightest play as in its intensest vehemence, never hesitating, never blundering, never ponderous, and never tired, expressing always exactly and directly what was meant to be expressed, whether it was to a tramp by the roadside, or to the crowd that thronged St. Paul's, or to a group of friends in Common Room, or to a companion in the afternoon walk; the retentive and well-ordered memory, enriched by ceaseless work, with eager interest in all he read and saw; the vivid and adventurous imagination; the invincible sense of humour, coming in sometimes whether he liked it or not, irrepressible, audacious, delightful, and unerring; the strong tenacity with which he held to what he meant, unshaken and unconfused by the doubts of allies or the assaults of enemies:—such were some of the merely intellectual gifts which come to mind as one tries to recall what it was to be with him. "Merely intellectual" he would certainly have called them, with decisive simplicity, if he had ever stayed to give any heed at all to them—mere implements to be employed in a man's work, to be taken care of only that they might be placed at the disposal of his ruling motive, and deriving from that motive absolutely all their real worth. And what, in Dr. Liddon's heart, beyond all that the world praised and criticised and liked and disliked, that enthroned and steadfast motive was, none who knew him well could doubt. It can be told most plainly in St. Paul's words, "That I might by all means save some." Men talked of him as a great orator, a leader among High Churchmen, uncompromising in controversy, and so forth; but the impulse of all his eagerness, the stay of all his determination, was as simple a care for the souls of men as ever filled the heart of a parish priest. That care he never seemed to lay aside. Men, women, and children, as he met them, as he spoke to them, through all external difference, had this one supreme and common interest for him—that he might per-

haps make it easier for them to know and do God's will, that he might somehow help forward in their lives the victory of God's love. That unflagging care commanded all the forces he could wield; he lived for it; and it was the secret of much that men might wonder at or fear or love or smile at in his ways. The dominance of that one interest gave a curious uniformity to the view he took of life, of its events and opportunities; and it gave a rare, unworldly courtesy to his dealings with all men. For in all alike he saw the same great drama moving to its vast issue; of all alike, in simplest sincerity, he held himself the slave for Christ's sake. "That I might by all means save some." No one was outside the range of that hope, of that task. The great people whom he came to know, in social or political or literary life; the athletic or pleasure-loving undergraduate on whom he had been asked to call; the poor woman who begged of him in the street; the cleverest man he met in an Oxford Common Room or in a London dinner-party; the servants who waited on him, the tradesmen with whom he dealt; the Arab sailors of his boat upon the Nile; the idle or fussy people who wrote him unnecessary letters; towards all he held himself bound by the very same necessity, and the great appeal that all, through the wide differences that severed them, could make to him was still the same: it was possible that he might somehow help them forward in the knowledge and the love of God. That was the one prospect which kept him, through all times of despondency about things in general, so dutifully, persistently, and generously hopeful about people individually. That was the one task for which he was always ready to spend and to be spent. The moment that his rapid and impetuous logic saw in any measure an impediment to such hopes as these he resolved to withstand it at all hazards and at any cost; and it was the same ever-fresh longing to do all he could do to bring men to God that made him at once the greatest of preachers and the best-loved of friends, that wore him out with work and warfare before he was an old man, and yet kept him to the end, in many ways, as young-hearted as a boy.

It is probable that the constancy of that same intense and restless care caused in large part his loss of love and hope for Oxford in the later years of his life. Perhaps the time has hardly come for measuring the justice of his dark forecasts; it may be many years before the changes he denounced can have their full effect. But, whether

he was right or wrong in his estimate of that effect, the heaviest sorrow in his thoughts about the place he once had loved came certainly from this: that he had seen the religious character and mission of Oxford gradually and very seriously impaired; that he believed that that character and mission were virtually destroyed; and that he could not help fearing that an advancing element in modern Oxford loved to have it so. It well may be that other feelings came to aggravate the influence of these convictions. There is no sharper trial for the calmness of a man's judgment than to live on year after year in a society where he has fought hard and has been defeated; and it is weary work to be always in the midst of strife about details, when one believes that the principle of life is gone; and it is very hard under such circumstances to be patient and reticent while people talk as though the place were still the same; but, howsoever the vexation of such trials may have tended to colour his distress and indignation with a deepening despondency, it is probable that there never was in Dr. Liddon's thoughts of Oxford any sadder, more besetting dread than this, that as time went on there would be fewer and fewer men in most of the colleges who could help a lad to live in the fear and love of God, and to take the side of faith in the battle of life. And so, at the very time when he would speak most gloomily of the University he was as keen as ever to do all he could for any undergraduate he knew; he struggled on against fatigue and suffering that he might keep up his voluntary lectures on the Sunday evenings; and after every lecture he would gather round him a group of men and talk to them as only he could talk, while no one ever guessed how tired and ill he was. So, too, he entered with quickening sympathy into the work of any tutor whom he knew to be anxious about the spiritual welfare of his pupils: so he wrote only two years ago to a friend in Oxford:—"To gather in one generation, even if no more is permitted, is a blessing of the highest order. Anything of this sort that individuals can do, in the absence of a pervading Christian system, must be good so far as it goes." "Work (such as this) is useful and blessed everywhere and at all times."

It is scarcely possible to speak here of those truths which, wrought into the very habit of his mind and living in his life, gave form and substance and authority to the one great motive of his work. Yet those who knew and watched him cannot but recall the absolute control with which

two great certainties constantly were telling on him. The first was that he was living in the sight of his Lord and Saviour; the second was that he must try to live as he would desire to have lived when he came to die. Those who would measure the intensity in him of that first conviction may see something of it in the last paragraph of the fourth lecture on *The Divinity of our Lord*; the second can be marked in many passages that he has written, and one of them may be cited here:—

"The expectation of a life after death enables us to see things in their true proportions." . . . "Self magnifies and distorts everything; the true corrective is to be found in the magnificent and tranquilising thought of another life. As men draw near to the threshold of eternity they see things more nearly as they are; they catch perspectives which are not perceived in the days of business and of health. When Bossuet lay a-dying, in great suffering and exhaustion, one who was present thanked him for all his kindness, and, using the court language of the day, begged him when in another world to think of the friends whom he was leaving, and who were so devoted to his person and his reputation. At this last word Bossuet, who had almost lost the power of speech, raised himself from the bed, and gathered strength to say, not without an accent of indignation, 'Don't talk like that. Ask God to forgive a sinner his sins.'"

THE TWO LEGENDS OF DÖLLINGER'S END.

From *The Church Times* (Church of England), London, September 19, 1890.

IN our generation the old seem to go faster than the young. Mr. Gladstone, by his valuable article in the *Speaker* on Professor Reusch's "Briefe und Erklärungen von I. von Döllinger über die Vaticanischen Decrete," has seized time by the forelock and anticipated all our editors and reviewers, and made them look like sluggards. A few days after the appearance of the book in Munich, the venerable English political leader, with a leader's instinct in other than political conflicts, perceived its significance, read it through, and sent his interesting and sympathetic account of it to the press. Mr. Gladstone, for many explicable reasons, shrinks from drawing a contrast between the great theologian of his own Oxford and the great theologian of Munich. The contrast is one which must inevitably

occupy the future historian of Catholic Christendom in our generation, for it lies at the very heart of the question between Rome and us, as well as between Rome and the Orthodox Christendom of the East. The work just issued by Dr. Reusch, and so rapidly seized and described by our vigorous old ex-Premier, however, is no mere compilation of Döllinger's latest judgments upon the Vatican decrees. It is an *Apologia* which had become a necessity of the hour. It is a defence of the master, by one of the most beloved and like-minded of his disciples, second only to the master in his encyclopaedical command of the whole range of Catholic and of modern Roman theology in all branches. Two legends were in swift process of formation concerning the faith in which Döllinger died, and this work was issued to provide the Church of God with history instead of legend.

Dr. von Döllinger had so much about him of the prophet, both in his character and in his unique position, that he could not avoid foreseeing that he was sure to be the subject of the most cruel misrepresentations after his death. He and his disciple, Dr. Reusch, in their common work on the successive casuistical controversies with which the Jesuits poisoned individual and social morality in Western Christendom, pointed out the dexterity with which the rulers of the Company managed that each side in a political or dynastic quarrel should be provided with a Jesuit advocate, so that, whatever the issue might be, the Jesuits could boast of their share in bringing it about, and claim their reward. There is now no distinction between Ultramontaniam and Jesuitism; whenever we speak of one, we name the other. The Vatican Council, as Döllinger maintained to the last day of his life, definitely closed the long struggle of old Catholicism against new Jesuitism by the victory of the latter, and by the excommunication of all Catholics who maintained that Ultramontaniam is neither religion, nor Christianity, nor Catholicity, but is the caricature of each. The absolute monarchy and infallibility of the Pope are grounded upon an assumption which history and Catholic tradition alike declare to be a lie. The system which has as its substructure and root an historical lie, as Döllinger always plainly called it, a "legend pretending to be history," needs a succession of legendary untruths for its support. Two such legends, or lies, we have lately seen in process of formation concerning the last hours of the most learned Catholic theologian of our century, each of which,

although one naturally excludes the other, has had its advocates, and for some time will have its advocates in the Vaticanist camp. The policy of Jesuitism, as Döllinger and Reusch have shown, has always been to "provide for the event," whatever it may be. It keeps an "alternative" in stock. Hence we see the two legends.

First, there is the legend that Döllinger died an impenitent heretic, or, to put it into Jesuit language, he continued to the end to be a rebel against the Divinely-appointed Pope-King of Christ's Kingdom. Secondly, there is the legend that he found a moment of grace before his departure, and died a penitent Catholic; or, in other words, he renounced all that he had believed, written, and taught, and made somehow or other an unwitnessed act of submission to the visible monarch of the Kingdom of Christ. The first legend was invented for the edification of ignorant Roman Catholics, in case it should be necessary for them to regard the educator of so many prelates and priests as the great heresiarch of our generation. Indeed, this legend was developed so fast, and to such a monstrous growth in South Germany, that he was actually "reported," as the Vaticanist *Mainzer Journal* says, "to have died, without spiritual aid, and in a water-closet." The object was too grossly evident. Poor peasants and pilgrims were to believe that the visitation of God, in vengeance for the insults done to His vicar in the Vatican, smote the heresiarch Döllinger exactly as He smote the heresiarch Arius, "Tot auf den Abort gefunden worden." It was doubtless meant to serve also as a negative assertion that the Vatican Council was on a level in all points with the Nicene Council. The further evolution of this infamous legend, this pious fraud, which would have thriven in the ninth century, was instantly arrested in the nineteenth century by plain medical testimony. Decent Roman Catholic papers, to their credit, have protested against this "Report of Döllinger's end," which was started in the city of St. Boniface, the Christian metropolis of Germany. But it is easier to contradict a lie than to kill it, and as the Mainz newspaper refused to withdraw its "report," or to produce evidence for it, it is not improbable that it may survive and flourish amongst the superstitious peasants who believed that the anger of God against Bismarck before he went to Canossa was the real cause of the blight in their potato fields. The Vaticanist controversialists in the press and the pulpit will assert that they never believed it. The scholars and

journalists of the party do not share the *Sancta Simplicitas* of the country pilgrims whom they send to the Black Virgin of Einsiedeln, or to the "Holy Grandmother" on the Annaberg, who holds the infant Saviour in one arm and the infant Madonna in the other.

The second legend, which is a flat denial of the first legend, had a better prospect of development in the newspapers, especially amongst Anglicans, Old Catholics, and Protestants. Döllinger, according to the second legend, died a penitent "Roman" Catholic. This equally false legend will be fully met, and disproved by adequate historical and documentary evidence, when the authentic biography of the great modern doctor of Christendom is published. Meanwhile, his learned disciple and fellow-labourer in the *Moralstreitigkeiten*, Professor Reusch, has within the last few days published the valuable body of testimony, which Mr. Gladstone has so speedily reviewed, and which will silence all the fabricators and ready believers of this legend. Under the general title of "Letters and Declarations of J. von Döllinger concerning the Vatican Decrees," he has gathered together a series of documents from Döllinger's pen, chiefly letters to Bishops and to Catholic friends, in which he justifies "the maintenance of an Old Catholic opposition to Ultramontanism and Jesuitism within the Catholic Church, and the importance of upholding the Old Catholic contest and testimony as the means of reconciling all the divided Christian confessions." So Professor Reusch describes the general character of this significant and incontrovertible demonstration that Döllinger was not, even in the *Guardian's* sense, a "Roman" Catholic, and certainly was less of a "Roman" Catholic in Cardinal Manning's sense than some feeble priests in English Orders and some of our young "acrobatic Ritualists" are. The collection is a text-book so full and rich that we cannot do more at present than chronicle its publication, and express a fervent wish for its immediate translation into English.

The book is all the more welcome on account of Professor Reusch's intimation that Döllinger himself had long been thinking of compiling such a testimony. In October, 1886, he wrote a letter to Dr. Reusch, while they were at work upon their joint history of the "Moral Controversies," in which he expressed his sense of the need of a final and definitive demonstration of his own persistent "Anti-Vaticanism," or, as he preferred to call it, his persistent "Old

Catholicism." He said in this letter that suggestions and entreaties to submit himself to the Pope had lately poured in upon him from several quarters. "I have recently had two verbal messages from the Pope," he wrote, "one shortly after the other. I have had a written appeal from the Archbishop of Munich, put into a most courteous and delicate shape: and I have had another written appeal from (Bishop) Hefele. Hence I myself am now feeling most intensely that I owe the world, before the sands of life have run out, the debt of a thorough explanation and declaration. There is still so much left to be said in this matter which has not as yet been said, or has been said in a language and a form which were *far too feeble*." Döllinger was under the impression that the work upon which he and Reusch were then engaged was a complete burning of the bridge between himself and the Roman Pontiff, as indeed the Roman controversialists at once recognised it to be. "Rome's influence," he wrote to the Old Catholic priest and university professor, Michelis, before the death of the latter, "has been very much more hurtful and ruinous than I had been able to conceive before 1860. I have again travelled, so to speak, throughout the whole territory of Church history, and this study has produced as its result incontrovertible proof upon proof of the falsehood of the Vatican decrees." Amongst the most instructive of the documents just published by Dr. Reusch is the correspondence, three years ago, between the Papal Nuncio Ruffo Scilla and Döllinger, and also Döllinger's long and powerful reply, four years ago, to the Archbishop of Munich, who flatteringly wrote to the great theologian, in July, 1886, "Your return to the Church of God would be a happy day to her Supreme Pastor, a day of jubilee to millions of the faithful, and a joy to the choirs of the blessed!" But that individualist act of submission to the Pope, which the Archbishop regarded as the return of a prodigal son to the father in Rome, was regarded by Döllinger as an act of apostasy from the faith once delivered to the saints. That "apostasy" was never committed, as the Vatican knows only too well; but it is naturally anxious to delude Anglicans and Protestants with the legend that its greatest foe in our century "died a Roman Catholic." A long time must pass before Döllinger's biography is published, and events have shown that there is a readiness abroad to believe the insulting legend which Dr. Reusch, by his timely intervention, has destroyed.

ROMANISTS ON RITUALISTS.

From *The Rock* (Church of England), London, September 19, 1890.

THE growing assimilation of Ritualism to genuine Romanism would perhaps lead us to expect that the Roman Catholic Press and the Bishops and Clergy of that communion in this country would commend those who are doing their work within the Church of England. Such, however, is not always the case. However they may be dealt with privately and individually, the Ritualists as a party are more commonly in public held up to reproach and ridicule by those from whom they might look for different treatment. We can seldom take up the *Tablet* or the *Catholic Times*, or read articles by Romish controversialists in the popular magazines, without finding severe and sarcastic notices of the opinions and practices of extreme High Churchmen. A few specimens of this kind may serve to draw attention to the fact and suggest an inquiry into the motives which may prompt these attacks. For be it remembered this attitude of Romanists towards Ritualists must be distinguished from their views as to whether the Ritualists are paving the way towards Rome. An ambitious monarch may patronise whilst he despises the rebel conspirators in that neighbour's kingdom which he wishes to subjugate.

The meeting of some one hundred and fifty clergy in London to consider what action they should take in anticipation of the Primate's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case afforded occasion to the *Catholic Times* to pass some scathing comments on this inconsistency in appealing, as some of them did, to "Œcumenical authority." "They talk," it says, "of a Provincial Synod, knowing well that the Archbishop of Canterbury will no more dare to summon a Provincial Synod than he would dare to assume command of the army; and that, if such a Synod were to assemble to-morrow, it would scoff at Œcumenical authority, and would condemn High Church doctrines and practices alike. Subterfuge after subterfuge, quibble after quibble, is the method of the Ritualistic Clergy." So, again, the attempts now made in Convocation, under the impulse of the same party, to revive Monastic Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods with dispensable vows, meets with scant sympathy from the Romish press. "On what principle," it is asked, "do High Churchmen, who point with pride to the Anglican Sisterhoods as a proof of their Catholicity, treat with cold disdain and neglect the Abbot of Llanthony and his

fellow-monks? We imagine the principle which the Anglican Bishops act upon is simply this: it is convenient to adopt the Sisterhoods, for they are popular; it is not convenient to recognise Father Ignatius." Still more biting was the sarcasm with which the *Tablet* wrote on "Anglicanism and Image Worship" at the time when St. Paul's reredos and its life-size image of the Virgin were in question. The *Tablet* then informed its readers that "There exists an authorised collection of sermons, which the Clergy are now permitted to read, and which under conditions they were once enjoined to read to their flocks in lieu of their own compositions. These sermons are the homilies of the Church of England, and every clergyman who subscribes the Thirty-nine Articles subscribes at the same time to an unreserved consent to them as 'containing a godly and wholesome doctrine necessary for these times.'" After these remarks the writer quoted at length from the homily against peril of idolatry and superfluous deckings of churches. The contrast between the principles and the practice of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's was thus exhibited. "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*"

On another occasion the *Tablet* fell foul of the Ritualists in these terms: "The curious pretensions of the Ritualistic party in the Church of England are gradually being laid bare in their marked and complete absurdity. Their determination to keep the wages of the Establishment for doing what it forbids looms out with wonderful clearness. . . . Every parson of the Establishment is to be allowed to wander at his own sweet will, and preach what doctrine he chooses, because the 'Spirituality' was not consulted about the establishment of the present Court of Appeal." It would be easy to multiply quotations of this kind. We rather hasten to ask, What is their drift and intention? Can it be that Rome looks on with scorn and indifference at the steady advance made by her friends towards the houses of rest and peace? This would be unnatural and incredible. The peans recently sung over the "Silver Jubilee" of Cardinal Manning, and the extravagant eulogies pronounced over the grave of Cardinal Newman, are sufficient proofs of her appreciation of such illustrious and highly-gifted proselytes. Even the arrival in the fold just now of a young Sheffield curate has been hailed with great joy. It is said that Mr. Thorpe is a nephew of the Archbishop of Canterbury. If there could have been a doubt on this point, the Romish

Bishop of Salford, at the recent conference of the "Catholic Truth Society" in Birmingham, made it perfectly plain how English Romanists regard this Romeward movement. In an outburst of sanguine anticipation he said that no impartial observer can contrast the England of the past with the England of to-day without declaring that the mind and heart and policy of the country have swung at least half-way round towards the Catholic Church. Whilst some of us have been straining our minds and hearts in one direction, shaking our heads and lamenting because the conversions are so few, behold, the whole country has become converted without observation. If the progression of change be at the same rate during the next sixty years as during the past, before the end of the next century England may be practically Catholic again. He also asserted with boastful arrogance, but, alas! with too much truth, that "the bishops, ministers, and people of the Church of England are busily engaged in ignoring or denouncing those very Articles which were drawn up in this eternal protest against the old religion. The statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been put up with honour over the principal side entrances to Westminster Abbey, and she has been recently enthroned under the dome of St. Paul's." We have in previous articles estimated the value of these idle vaunts. Our object here is not to appreciate or controvert them, but to contrast them with the strain of invective and ridicule usually indulged in on this subject by the Romish press in England. It certainly seems at first sight difficult to reconcile the one attitude with the other. For the clue we must look below the surface, since things are not always what they seem. It may be that in the Romish camp there is a feeling of disappointment that so few have crossed the rubicon of late years and actually gone over to Rome. They see many, through the present laxity of discipline, allowed to teach and practise Romanism within our Church, but they are men who will not bow to authority either within or without her pale. This, to a zealous and loyal Roman Catholic, appears an anomalous and despicable position. His own Church exacts absolute and unqualified submission. No half measures can there be tolerated. They that join its standard must accept all or nothing.

There is in such utterances a warning voice to both individuals and to the country at large. Both the reproaches and the rejoicings of the Romish Press are significant. The position of the Ritualistic party is seen

by all, except by themselves, to be increasingly false and inconsistent. There is no doubt a gradual process of leavening and undermining going on, which, if it do not soon receive a decided check, is fraught with calamity to both the Church and State of England. We have hope, however, that at least moderate High Churchmen will have their eyes opened; may we also hope that earnest and thoughtful Ritualists—for there are such—will perceive the unnatural and strained relations which they are producing, and will feel that they must either honestly, like Cardinal Newman, go over bodily to Rome, or else revert to the old lines, and to good Protestant principles? The Romish rule is at least logical: the Ritualist attempt to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds would be absurdly grotesque were it not so deplorably mischievous.

THE REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER,
D.D., PREACHER AND PHILANTHROPIST.

BY AUGUSTUS.

From *The New York Observer*, October 9, 1890.

THE death of the Rev. George Barrell Cheever, D.D., which took place October 1, removes a man whose life and influence have been powerful in literature, theology and moral reform for more than half a century. Full of years, respected and honored even by bitter opponents, he kept on working till a few weeks before his death, when he took to his bed, and spent his last hours in prayer. Dr. Cheever was born in Hallowell, Me., April 17, 1807. His father was a printer and publisher, and his grandfather, Nathaniel Cheever, of Salem, Mass., is said to have been the first man whose blood was shed in the Revolutionary war. Inheriting literary tastes from his father and grandfather, together with religious inclinations, he early devoted his attention to literature of a pure and inspiring nature, and was a reader of religious and thoughtful books while a mere boy. He was educated at Hallowell Academy and at Bowdoin College, and was in the class of 1825, together with Longfellow, Nathaniel Hawthorne, the historian J. S. C. Abbott, Senator J. W. Bradbury, Representative Jonathan Cilley, and other notable men. His religious and intellectual tendencies led him naturally to seek the pulpit, and he entered upon ministerial studies at Andover

and remained in the Theological Seminary there until his ordination in 1830.

During the time spent as a theological student he contributed several articles to *The United States Literary Gazette* and *The American Monthly Magazine*. His literary style developed rapidly, and before he had completed his studies at the seminary articles from his facile pen were welcomed by *The Biblical Repository* and *The North American Review*. He also compiled the popular American Commonplace Books of Prose and Poetry, and edited the Select Works of Archbishop Leighton. He was settled as a pastor at Newburyport, and went from there to the Essex street Congregational church, Boston, and in 1833, when only twenty-six years of age, he assumed the pastorate of the Howard street church, Salem.

Soon after his settlement he entered with great earnestness into the Unitarian controversy, and wrote a "Defence of the Orthodoxy of Cudworth," which made him many enemies whose hostility was developed upon his trial later on. As a champion of temperance reform he sought to prohibit the manufacture and sale of rum, and wrote for the Salem *Landmark* an allegory entitled, "Inquire at Deacon Giles's Distillery." This created considerable stir at Salem and through the country at large. Soon after its publication the *Landmark* office was attacked at night, and the author of the article assaulted at midday in the public street by the foreman of a Salem distillery. Dr. Cheever was indicted for a libel upon Deacon John Stone, of Salem, who owned a large distillery in the town, and who was supposed to be the model which Dr. Cheever used in creating "Deacon Amos Giles." Dr. Cheever was tried before a jury evidently hostile to him, and sentenced by a judge who had little sympathy for an orthodox clergyman, to thirty days' imprisonment in the common jail.

Rufus Choate defended Dr. Cheever upon his first trial, and he made a brilliant speech in his own behalf before the final sentence. Before entering upon his defence, Dr. Cheever solemnly reiterated his plea of not guilty to the indictment preferred against him. . . . He then proceeded to the justification and defence of the article charged as libellous, on the ground that it was never written or intended for Deacon Stone or any individual, the allusions to known truth not having been introduced, as avowed in the indictment, for the purpose of a personal, malicious application. It was no part of his object, in the composition of

that article, to defame, vilify, or injure the character of any particular distiller whatever, or to bring indignation or disgrace upon any one's family connections. The object of the piece was to portray, in as strong a light as possible, the real nature and consequences of the manufacture of ardent spirits in a distillery. The conception of the character of the deacon was purely imaginary, and never intended to be applied to any individual whatever. The doctrines which the deacon of the dream was described as having heard preached were grouped together, not to mark an individual, but partly because he knew that the tendency of those doctrines was to lull the conscience in sin, and partly because he supposed that the evangelical churches throughout the country had very generally adopted the resolution that the traffic in ardent spirits is an immorality, so that it would be difficult to find any such Church retaining in its communion, especially in the sacred office of deacon, a professor of religion who persists in getting his living by the vices, miseries and diseases of his fellowmen.

He contended that in the eye of the law there was nothing in the allusions of the piece which could be considered libellous, for there was nothing in them of untruth; nor was there aught of malice or inimical intention in their introduction as portions of the article. For the defence of their use, he threw himself on the protection of the statute which makes their truth a justification, alleging the importance of the object which he had in view, and the purity of motive with which he had presented it.

He contended that malice was an essential ingredient in a libel, and that there must be extensive evidence of it; which the government had entirely failed to produce. He said that the *prima facie* evidence on the article itself was not that of malice, but that of its having been written to aid the cause of temperance, and that a verdict against the defendant could never have been obtained under the protection of the statute, unless the jury were charged to bring him in guilty, whatever were his motives. If any man was at a loss for a motive, he begged him to contemplate for a moment the nature of the traffic in ardent spirit, and the ruinous tendency of the business of distilling. He contended that there must be liberty for the use of illustrations from actual life, and reference to actual occurrences in our efforts to advance the cause of temperance, and that the liberty of the press is a mockery, if the truth may not be

told of every man's occupation. The law on libel was never made for the protection of men's sins or immoral practices. Disgrace, he said, was the inevitable tax that every man pays to society, who chooses to make his living out of other men's sins. The conjunction of Rum and Bibles in the very nature of the inconsistency was irresistibly ridiculous, and any man would be justified for censuring it.

He went on to a full statistical detail of the evils resulting from the manufacture and use of ardent spirit. Especially he dwelt upon the consequences to the souls of men in eternity. The declaration that no drunkard shall enter the kingdom of God is, after all, he said, the one on which depends the great guilt of the manufacture, the sale, and the use of ardent spirit. In every stage of the business it is no more nor less than the incessant preparation of human souls for hell. The Attorney-General, he said, knew well that he did not need the authority of the Vatican for the declaration of this awful truth. It rested on a higher than any earthly authority, the Word of God.

These statements, Dr. Cheever said, he made as a complete justification of the article for which he was arraigned, and for the purpose of recalling to the mind of the Court the dreadful nature and alarming prevalence of the evil against which it was directed. After further speaking of the traffic in ardent spirit as an opposed barrier to the spread of Christianity, and the agency of the distillery in destroying the power of those moral and religious truths on which the whole well-being of our country depends—he proceeded to declare that however he might be persecuted, his lips should not be silent on the enormity of this traffic; but that while he lived, he should continue, perhaps with more prudence for the lesson he had learned, to rebuke the sin. He spoke of the difficulty in coming at the deep-rooted causes of intemperance. The old ways were worn out, and strong and sharp instruments were needed. He reminded the Court of the course which had been taken by the Attorney-General in discharging two of the individuals engaged in the assault upon his person. He solicited the favor of the Court upon manly ground, and asked for an acquittal because he was guiltless of the crime of a personal libel on Deacon Stone. He concluded as follows:—

"Could the amount of misery, in time and eternity, which any one distillery in Salem has occasioned, be portrayed before your honor, I should feel no solicitude as to

the result. Let the mothers that have been broken-hearted, the wives that have been made widows, the children that have been made fatherless, the parents borne down with a bereavement worse than death in the vices of their children, be arrayed in your presence; let the families reduced to penury, disgraced with crime, and consumed with anguish, that the owners of one distillery might accumulate their wealth, be gathered before you. Let the prosecutor in this suit go to the graveyards and summon their shrouded tenants; let him summon before you the ghosts of those whose bodies have been laid in the grave from one distillery; let him call up, if he could, the souls that have been shut out from heaven and prepared for hell, through the instrumentality of the liquor manufactured there; and let him ask what is *their* verdict. Need I suppose the judgment? Surely it would be said, let the defendant be shielded. Even if he has overstepped the limits of exact prudence in his efforts to portray the evils of intemperance, in the name of mercy let the great object of the effort shield *him*, and let the law be turned against *that dreadful business*, whose nature he has aimed to delineate."

Upon his release from prison, he resigned his pastorate and went to Europe, contributing letters to the *New York Observer* from England, Spain, and other countries. Upon his return he accepted a call from the Allen street Presbyterian church of this city, where he distinguished himself by a discussion with Bishop Hughes on "Hierarchical Despotism," in which he maintained that the Bible should not be excluded from the public schools. He also delivered a course of lectures on the "Pilgrim's Progress," afterwards published in book form. His health becoming impaired, he visited Europe again in 1844, and published the result of his travels in several volumes which were largely circulated. He returned in 1846, and was for a time editor of *The New York Evangelist*. The Church of the Puritans was now formed, and Dr. Cheever invited to become its pastor. An elegant white marble church was built in Union Square where the Tiffany warehouse now stands. After Dr. Cheever's retirement from the ministry, this building was sold, taken down carefully, and transferred by the Baptist Society which purchased it, to West Fifty-third street, where it still stands. During all this time Dr. Cheever had appeared many times as a lecturer, and had published poems, religious works, and others directed against slavery. After the

repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the passage of the Fugitive Slave law, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, the pulpit of the Church of the Puritans became a centre of attraction to all who sought the abolition of slavery. The church was crowded to the doors with men thronging to hear the preacher, who, with the earnestness and manner of an ancient prophet, denounced slaveholders as well as the system, and attacked without reserve all who apologized for the owners of slaves or upheld the laws which protected slavery in the United States. Many of Dr. Cheever's parishioners objected to his course and to the hospitality extended to the Church Anti-Slavery Society, an organization which favored non-fellowship with slaveholders. In the summer of 1860 Dr. Cheever went to England with a commission from his Church to represent its position to British Christians. A year later he returned home and continued his warfare upon slavery, preaching on several occasions in the United States Senate Chamber and in the hall of the House of Representatives on "The Rights of the Colored Race to Citizenship and Representation."

The Church of the Puritans declined in membership after the war was over, its property was sold and a large part of the proceeds were given to the Presbyterian church at Harlem, which took also the name, and Dr. Cheever retired in 1867 to live in Englewood, having given his city house to the American Board of Missions and the American Missionary Association. But he did not retire from literary or philanthropic work. Within the present year he has contributed to the columns of the *New York Observer*, and though more than fourscore years of age, he could not keep silent when righteousness needed a defender, or wrong a powerful opponent.

He was by nature a polemic and a champion, but his heart was full of charity and kindness even for those whom he denounced. He was most amiable and charitable in private life, and gave generous gifts to all good works, and especially to home and foreign missions. His books would make a little library, but are mainly reproductions of lectures, essays, sermons and letters previously published. He died at his home, Englewood, New Jersey, where he had lived honored and beloved for the past twenty years, and was buried in Greenwood beside his wife, who preceded him to rest four years ago, after having been his companion through a long life.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

ONE CHANGE THAT ALL WILL APPROVE.

BY REV. HENRY FAIRBANKS, PH.D., ST
JOHNSBURY, VT.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, October 2, 1890.

THE questions relating to "methods of administration" by the American Board are receiving careful consideration by the able committee appointed to report upon them, and a public discussion of them now would be manifestly untimely. There is, however, one simple and comparatively slight change suggested, of such evident advantage that it would be well that all friends of the Board should have their attention called to it, especially as it is entirely independent of partisan interest. I refer to the method of conducting the personal and theological examination of candidates for missionary appointment.

When the Board refused to sanction a reference to a council of churches of the question of theological fitness for appointment, it was with the distinct understanding that this question was left with the Prudential Committee, upon the alleged ground of their ability and fitness.

It was of course understood that the question to be decided by them in each case was not ecclesiastical, determining fellowship or recognition as ministers, but purely prudential, namely, whether the views of the candidate were so nearly the same as the average views of the contributors who would be called upon to support him that he would preach the truth which they give their money to propagate. Their function is like that of a parish or church business committee who would select a minister whose views of truth accord with those of the people who employ him.

The vote of the Board gave the determination of this question to the Prudential Committee, a body at least equal in ability, and perhaps in number, to the average council. But, in order that the Committee may have the same opportunity to act fairly and wisely that the ordinary council has, the candidate should come before it in the same way, and, along with his statement, make his personal impression.

No council could safely, or would, depute its moderator and scribe to examine a candidate for ordination by correspondence, or privately, and then at an adjourned meeting act upon their report. The method is objectionable, and would prove dangerous. The moderator would write asking the can-

didate to be free and tell him all his thought, and whether he had any unusual theory, or any doubt as to any of the doctrines of the orthodox system. A dull man would say no. A morbidly conscientious man, or a man given to thinking for himself, would remember some perplexities, some questions; would be reminded that some things which on the whole he believed, were not as clear to him as others. Though he had never had doubts to be mentioned to professors or fellow-students, he perhaps would have to say, when urged to be perfectly frank, that sometimes sin seemed to him so fearful a thing, and the doom of the finally impenitent so terrible, that the soul could hardly continue to bear such suffering—it might lose its sensitiveness, it might shrivel, in that flame. If he made such an answer orally before a council, a very little questioning would prove him really unsound, or else would bring out the fact that he held no false view, and that his hesitation to strongly affirm the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked grew out of a most intense conception of the awful guilt of sin, which led to an equally intense apprehension of the wonder of the atonement, and a consecration of all his powers to the work of saving the lost. But, having confessed his hesitation to fully affirm, the conscientious examiner of course inquires just how and why he doubts.

The candidate has written that he doubts, and, having to write again, he must explain and defend his doubt. And so that doubt is strengthened in his own mind, and, being defended, becomes so prominent in his letters that, when the long correspondence is read, the man seems to have more interest in what was at first only a slight uncertainty than in the whole body of truth.

The moderator, however much interested in him, cannot do less than to ask him to consent to have the final submission of his case to the council deferred until his views are so clarified that he is able to write that he believes in the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. This he cannot fully affirm, and every letter that he has written has made it more impossible. The method of examination has made him a defender of a false theory, and the council, if it reassembles, cannot ordain him without indorsing a false view.

The correspondence method is a most effective agency in leading one who has any doubts to commit himself to their defense, and to move him further toward error than he intended. Some doubt which merely implied ignorance, or lack of interest in

perhaps a side doctrine, crystallizes into the false opinion that seems defensible. The method generates heresy.

Now in the case of an applicant for missionary appointment, it would seem to be perfectly feasible to secure the requisite testimonials, and certificate of physician, and then to allow the candidate to appear before the Prudential Committee and state how he is prompted to enter the service, and what are his views of truth. As determining fitness for missionary service, a personal presentation is worth more than scores of letters, and as determining "the amount and spiritual force" of any acknowledged doubt, it is incomparably better.

It may be thought that the committee has not time for meeting all candidates, or even all who are expected to preach or teach in the higher departments, but generally a rather brief examination would enable them to understand the spirit and faith of a man, and it is doubtful whether more of the time of the Committee would necessarily be taken with each case than is generally used under the present system.

The fact that the candidate may now have a hearing with the Committee if he requests it is of small advantage, for this is expected only in cases which have already made an unfavorable impression, where the unfortunate method has already wrought its bad results.

Another evil result of the present system is the ill feeling that has been cultivated against the home secretary. It may be that the attack is directed against an individual because that is the most effective and cheapest way to injure the party or the principles which he is understood to represent. But it is unfair and needless to continue a system which makes one man the official curator of the theological soundness of the envoys of the churches, while the honored Committee see only through his eyes and hear only through his ears. It is unjust to expose any man to the attacks which any conscientious discharge of such duties must bring upon him; it is unsafe to trust the wisest man with such responsibility; it is dangerous to expose the interests of the truth to suffer if the attack upon one man can succeed.

Studying this whole subject, I believe that nine-tenths of the embarrassing difficulties of these recent years would have been avoided if candidates for missionary appointment had been allowed to make their first statement of Christian experience, reasons for entering the service, and views of Biblical truth, in the hearing of the

whole Committee. To relieve the secretary from needless exposure and his views of truth from harmful attack, to relieve candidates from the danger of being led into serious error by the defense of some slight doubt, and to give the Board the advantage of the wisdom of the Committee to whom it refers the question of the theological fitness of candidates for missionary service, it is most important that these candidates be examined in the presence of the Committee rather than by correspondence.

HOW TO BE A GOOD HEARER.

BY WM. M. TAYLOR, D.D.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, October 9, 1890.

WE have had in recent days a good deal of criticism of the pulpit, and for my part, I am not disposed to quarrel with that when it is intelligent, discriminating and just. But it is only seldom that anything is said about the hearers. We have had also "Lectures on Preaching," in which many have given the lessons of their experience for the guidance of those who are preparing for the ministry, and certainly I should be one of the last to find fault with these. But it is almost time now, in my judgment, that some good, wise, and faithful layman should give a course of "Lectures on Hearing," and tell his brethren in the pews how they can hear to edification, while at the same time he informs preachers what particular sorts of sermons have done him the most good. I dare not presume to do anything of that kind, but while our lay brother is getting ready, I may try to give a few hints on the subject that may be of service to my readers.

There should, in the first place, be some preparation made for getting what an old Scottish Christian used to call "a good hearing." For the hearing of the Gospel is not an isolated act in a man's life. It is connected with, and depends very largely on, many other things. If, for example, during the week, he is entirely absorbed in business, and never permits himself to think of spiritual and eternal matters, the presumption is that he will bring his business into the sanctuary on the Lord's day, and if he do, the eloquence of an Apollos will not avail to drive it away. But if during the week he has been trying faithfully to transact his business for God, he will be ready on the Lord's day to listen to the

message which God in his providence has sent him through the lips of his pastor. If again he never thinks of his minister from the moment when, on the one Sabbath, he leaves the church porch, to that when, on the next, he enters it again, it is almost certain that the service will be a weariness to him, and his listening will be listless and indifferent.

Thus interest in the hearing of God's Word preached on the Lord's Day will depend on the maintenance of devotional habits during the week. The pastor at his ordination and installation is "charged" to be a man of prayer, and that is right. He never can be a faithful minister otherwise. But it is equally important that the hearer should be the same. He will never get the full benefit of a sermon unless he is so, and, on the other hand, if out of love to his Saviour and to his pastor, he prays daily that a blessing may be sent to him through the pulpit, he will be eagerly on the watch in the pew for the answers to these prayers, and he will never watch in vain.

But if this be true of the week as a whole, it is especially so of the Lord's Day morning. That ought not to be a time of bustle and hurry, but rather one of quiet thought and prayer. The reading of the morning should be either in the Scriptures themselves, or in one of those classics of the closet wherewith devout men have enriched our literature. Half an hour, then, with such a book as Phelps's "Still Hour," or Matheson's "My Aspirations," or Leighton's "Commentary on First Peter," or Tholuck's "Hours of Christian Devotion," or, better than any other, the Book of Psalms, will prepare the soul for the descent into it of the Holy Spirit, and that will make the hearing in the sanctuary both profitable and delightful. How much better as a preparation for the hearing of the gospel is an exercise like that than the perusal of the Sunday newspaper! I suppose that there is really more Sunday work on the Monday morning's paper than on that of the Sunday, but what must be the dissipating effect of having the mind filled with all sorts of incongruous subjects just before going to the house of prayer! I cannot speak from experience here, but I am sure that few things would more thoroughly unfit me for preaching than to rise from my newspaper and rush into the pulpit, with the same precipitancy as I fear many throw down their Sunday papers and hurry to the church, only to find that in spite of all their haste they are too late after all! Of old it was, "when the dew fell all

round about the camp, that the manna fell upon it." The moisture of the dew, as it would seem, was needed to fix and detain the manna. And so the influences of the Holy Spirit on the heart are required to fix in it, and keep in it, the Word read or heard. But the Spirit does not usually descend amid such surroundings and occupations as I have just described, and therefore we should seek to have before hearing a time of devotional quietude on the morning of the first day of the week.

But now let us come to the actual hearing. It is surely self-evident to say that we ought to hear with attention. That which the preacher takes into the pulpit for you, at least, be he worthy of his office, is the very best that he can produce. He has prepared it as in God's sight. He has given to it thought and prayer. It has been given to him in God's providence with some special purpose that concerns either his hearers as a whole, or some individuals among them. Therefore their attitude should be that described in the words of Cornelius to Peter, "Now, therefore, we are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." *All here present before God.* What words are these! The preacher ought to remember them as well as the hearers, and the hearers as well as the preacher. That will make him earnest and it will make them attentive. For public worship is no mere matter of form. It is a being "together before God." Therefore the preacher will "stir up the gift that is in him," and the hearer will rouse himself to listen. He will train himself to follow the speaker. He will not allow any alluring association to draw his mind away from the truths which are put before him. He will leave his business behind him for the time. He will forget to criticise the earthiness of the vessel, because of his eagerness to get at the treasure which it contains. He will recognize that in the providence of God's Spirit, there is something in the daily ministration specially designed for him, and he will watch most closely lest he should miss that. He will regard his hearing as an opportunity, and he will seek to make the most of it as such. And if the preacher should be undeniably dry and unedifying, he will try to take the consolation presented by the good George Herbert in these lines:

Judge not the preacher, for he is thy judge.
If thou mislike him thou conceiv'st him not.
God calleth preaching folly. Do not grudge
To pick out treasures from an earthen pot.
The worst speak something good; if all want sense,
God takes a text and preaches patience.

But it is equally important that we should hear for ourselves. Many are exceedingly benevolent with what they hear. They give the whole sermon away to others, and keep nothing for themselves. As point after point is made, they say within themselves, "I hope A. B. is here, that suits him exactly. What a description that is of C. D., surely he cannot fail to recognize himself as he listens, and it would be edifying to know what he thinks of his portrait. What a lesson that is for E. F., but as likely as not she is too much occupied with taking an inventory of her neighbor's articles of dress, to hear anything about it;" and so on and so on. Now that is all very benevolent, *in a sense*, but it is a benevolence that is rooted in self-conceit. It is, besides, akin to malice, and it doth not "minister grace to the hearer." In this matter we must keep everything to ourselves, and those are the most profitable discourses in listening to which the hearer is most frequently constrained to say, "That means me."

But once more we ought to hear with independence. The preacher is not to do our thinking for us, but to stimulate us to think and determine for ourselves. His teachings are to be accepted by us only so far as they are in harmony with the sacred Scriptures. His interpretations of these Scriptures are neither inspired nor infallible, and therefore they must be tested and judged by each of his hearers for himself. It might, no doubt, be a convenient thing to have some one to make application for us of the principles of the Bible, in every perplexing case of conduct or casuistry that arises in our experience, but that is not the way taken by the Lord to discipline his people into strength. To have a spiritual director to tell us always what precisely we should do, and what we should avoid, would make and keep us weak as babes. Therefore no intelligent hearer should allow a fellow-man, even if he be a preacher, to dictate to him, either what he is to believe, or how, in certain case, he is to act. Of course what the preacher says should not be rejected without careful examination. If the examination sustains him his teaching should be gratefully received; but if it do not sustain him, it should be rejected. Everything heard from the pulpit should be weighed in "the balance of the sanctuary," and they who act upon this principle will receive the commendation given to the Bereans "who received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so."

A congregation of such hearers will stimulate any right-minded preacher to give them of "the finest of the wheat," and under his influence they will become both intellectually, morally and spiritually, leaders of the community in the midst of which they dwell.

It only now remains to say a word or two of that which should come after hearing. Food must be digested as well as eaten. Now what digestion is to eating, that meditation is to hearing. It assimilates what we hear, and makes it contribute to our growth in grace. But alas! meditation is rapidly becoming a "lost art." A great living English preacher has said, "I, for my part, believe that there are few Christian duties more neglected than meditation, the very name of which has fallen into a comparative disuse that argues ill for the frequency of the thing. We are so busy discussing, defending, inquiring or preaching and teaching that we have no time and no leisure of heart for quiet contemplation, without which the exercise of the intellect upon Christ's truth will not feed, and busy activity, even in Christ's cause, may starve the soul." Let us therefore cultivate this neglected exercise. Willmette in his "Hints on Reading" has said, "Proportion one hour's reflection to one hour's reading and so dispirit the book into the student." So I would say, let every time of hearing be followed by a time of meditation.

Then after meditation comes action. To hear week after week without seeking to carry out what we hear, will only harden the heart. But to keep the conduct abreast of the conviction produced in us by hearing will make us better hearers as we advance. When our errors are discovered to us, let us give them up. When our evil courses are pointed out, let us go in them no more. When our sins are brought home to us, let us repent of them and return unto the Lord. I have heard Mr. Spurgeon tell of a woman who on being asked what text her pastor had preached from on the preceding Sunday, replied that she could not exactly remember it, but it was something about false measures. "What sort of a sermon did he give?" "Well," said she, "I can't tell you much about the sermon, but when I came home I went straight away and burned the bushel." Depend upon it, that woman got still more benefit from the next sermon she heard, and if only we would go and do likewise after every Sabbath service there would be less complaint of the decadence of the pulpit. I conclude with quoting the words of the Apostle James:

"Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Wherefore putting away all filthiness, and overflowing of wickedness, receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own souls. For if any one is a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror: for he beholdeth himself and goeth away, straightway forgetting what manner of man he was. But, he that looketh unto the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing."

Broadway Tabernacle, New York.

THE CATHOLICS AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D.

From *The National Baptist*, Philadelphia, September 18, 1890.

THE *Independent* of Sept. 4 gives a symposium on this subject from eminent men in different denominations. We quote as much as our limits will permit:

"The United States became a nation on the fundamental principle of religious liberty. Other nations had reached the point of religious toleration, but none had adopted a system of religious liberty. Toleration implies a State religion. Liberty implies no State religion. Religion is left to the individual and his conscience. Accordingly no special form of religion can be in any way fostered by governmental aid. The least patronage of a religious sect is a violation of religious liberty. Religions must grow from their own vitality and not from State culture. This is not only the sole condition of religious liberty, but it is the most favorable condition of religion itself. State interference must always mar religion, however much it may give it the appearance of prosperity. State interference brings in the discordant element of politics, detrimental to all religion.

"It is from these premises we insist that religion must never be taught in our public schools. Any form of religious teaching must have a sectarian character as against other forms; and to that degree such teaching in our public schools would be a viola-

tion of our national principle of religious liberty.

"Because a devout Christian would like to have all American children instructed in the evangelical doctrine, he has no more right to have it taught in the public schools than a devout Jew, in his ardent desire to have all American children instructed in Judaism, has to have the Talmud taught in the public schools. In either case religious liberty is violated. The piety that would force such instruction is of the same sort that burned Giordano Bruno.

"The public school should have as its one object the preparation of the child to form an intelligent member of the State. For this he must know how to read and write and compute numbers, and must become acquainted with the history and institutions of his country. There the public school has exhausted its function.

"Moral influence should be exerted constantly on the pupil by moral teachers; but this morality is what is admitted by all citizens, the morality of truth, justice and purity as consonant with the divine will and the best interests of mankind. This morality is taught not by books, but by example and occasional precept. This morality is alike respected by every religion, for it is the dictate of the universal conscience. Each religion may claim to be the true basis of this morality, but the school will have to do with the morality and not the religion.

"The religion should be taught at home and in the church. There it can be rendered specific and detailed. The important doctrines may there be carefully inculcated and a strong religion imparted, when the public school at best could furnish only a very weak religion.

"The churches or synagogues should have their parochial schools, or their equivalents, where the children could go after a two or three years' course at the public schools, and be instructed both in religion and in the higher branches of learning.

"The State has nothing to do with either of these. Normal schools and State colleges should be extinguished. The State has no right to furnish any citizen gratis with the luxuries and remunerative advantages of higher education. It might as well furnish each citizen with a house and farm. Its only defense of State education is State preservation, and the classics and geometry cannot be taught under that plea.

"If the public school had, at farthest, a three years' curriculum, the pupil would have ample time for the parochial school or

its equivalent, and the State would be relieved of a great pecuniary burden. In New York City, for example, instead of multiplying our expensive school edifices, we should need only half of what we have.

"The cry of irreligious schools, under this American system, is just as senseless as would be the cry of irreligious reading-rooms or irreligious eating-houses, because no religion was apparent in them. The growth of religion in our country is due to its religious liberty. Injure that religious liberty and you check that growth. And not only do you check the growth of religion, but you engender controversies that infiltrate our politics and prepare the way for the overthrow of all liberties. Religious contests form the fertile soil of tyrannies, and it is for us Americans to avoid carefully the beginnings of a false system that would intensify religious hatreds and strife. While the Government is neutral, all religions can grow according to their own vitality, and the truth will eventually triumph peacefully and satisfactorily to all."

Wayland Hoyt, D.D., quotes from "The Judges of Faith: Christian *vs.* Godless Schools," a work written by a Roman Catholic priest and endorsed by Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Gibbons and six other Roman Catholic bishops and high officials. Dr. Hoyt, after ample citations, adds:

"Certain things are very manifest from this reading of this Roman Catholic book.

"*First.* The chief opposition to our public schools is not from the Roman Catholic laity, but is from the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. That is, at least, indirectly apparent on every page of this publication. If the spirit of the Roman Catholic laity were hostile to our public schools, it would not require such persistent and tremendous fulmination from every quarter as fills these pages. You will find much talk here about the sacred rights of parents as to choice of schools for their children. The simple truth is, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy are interfering all the time and whenever possible with the sacred rights of parents in this regard. They are compelling parents by the threat of excommunication. That, to a Roman Catholic, means much. In a Roman Catholic Catechism of Christian Doctrine, prepared and enjoined by the order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and published by ecclesiastical authority, I find the following question and answer:

"Q. Are all bound to belong to the Church?

"A. All are bound to belong to the Church; and he who knows the Church to

be the true Church and remains out of it cannot be saved."

"To be denied the Sacraments and so to be thrust out of what they believe to be the true Church is, then, for the Roman Catholic, to be lost eternally. It is this, to Roman Catholic parents, tremendous weapon, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy are wielding against our public schools. The Hierarchy is massing its artillery against the rights of parents, and from the vantage-ground of their capture is making assault upon our common school system. The trouble is mainly and precisely with the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. We should have none of this clash and contest about our public schools were it not for them. A Roman Catholic layman writes in a pamphlet from which I quote:

"The parochial school movement did not originate with the Catholic laity; they were not consulted at its inception; they have not since been afforded an opportunity to say whether they approved of it or not. From the beginning until to-day the Catholic laity of America have been treated in this important matter on the explicit understanding, on the part of the clergy, that it is a thing about which they are not entitled to have an opinion, except such as are dealt out ready-made to them by the clergy, who claim to be the only competent or rightful judges regarding the education of the laity."

"Such persistent refusal on the part of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to consult or care for the wishes of the laity is, to say the least, un-American.

"*Second.* Notice the clear present cue of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy; it is to sneer at and stigmatize our public schools as 'godless.' Almost wholly for their sakes, because in this free America we would be scrupulously careful of the least trenching on even the shyest rights of conscience, what could in any wise rightfully be called sectarian instruction has been removed from the teaching in our common schools. Very great deference to Roman Catholics has been shown here. But now when what they demanded has been done, when American fair play has been so conspicuously displayed, the Roman Catholic clergy turn with bitter attack upon the entire common school system and stigmatize it 'godless,' that they may depreciate it among their people, and if possible destroy it altogether.

"And the comparative results as to morality between our public schools and Roman Catholic parochial schools may be plainly enough seen from the following statistics gathered by Mr. Dexter A. Hawkins from

the census of 1870. It seems, according to these statistics, there are furnished to every ten thousand inhabitants in the United States :

	<i>Illiterates.</i>	<i>Paupers.</i>	<i>Criminals.</i>
By Public Schools of State of Massachusetts	71	69	11
By Public Schools of 21 States	350	170	75
By Roman Catholic Schools 1,400	410	160	

"In the State of New York the Roman Catholic parochial school system turns out three and a half times as many paupers as the public school system.

"*Third.* Look at the fact confronting us. On the one side our vast system of common schools, the substruction of our great Republic, dear to our hearts, venerable with our history. On the other hand, thoroughly organized celibate clergy, cut off from every participation in the cares or knowledge or responsibilities of parenthood, receiving primal and chief orders from a foreign, Italian, celibate Pope, setting themselves to damage and, if possible, wreck the very basis on which our civilization and institutions rest. If this is not foreign interference, what can be foreign interference ?

"*Fourth.* Is it not a really momentous question—how far those who accept the teachings of such a hierarchy as is disclosed by these quotations can be much trusted on our school boards and in the management of our public schools ? I cannot help thinking of these most righteous words of Mr. Edwin D. Mead of Boston :

"Whenever any decision or instruction goes so far as to compel any Roman Catholic father to withdraw his own children from the public schools, when he comes to think it a sin to send them there, or to act as if it were a sin, then surely it will be a sin for him to have a hand in their administration, and his simple manhood will compel him to withdraw from the school board, if he belongs to it, and from the school-room, if he be a teacher. The public school must be in the hands of its friends. No man should be tolerated for a day in the administration of the public schools who is not a believer in them."

"*Fifth.* Consider the veritable and tremendous menace to our institutions which necessarily springs from this attitude of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to our public schools. A main benefit of our public school system is that in it there is the most thorough mingling of the children of all sorts and classes of our citizens. In these schools and because of this fact the great American lesson of political equality is taught as it can possibly be taught in no

other place or way. This lesson is the undermost principle of our Republican civilization. In these public schools more rapidly than in any other place, the children of our immigrant population lay off the features, garb, language of foreigners and become Americanized, become fitted to discharge in after years the duties and functions of American citizens. Now, to gather into parochial schools so great a number of the children of foreign-born parents as is done in these schools so steadily insisted on by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, is to form and foster a great company of future American citizens who have been for their lives long segregated, set apart by themselves, as a special class, denied the breathing of the vigorous air of our American institutions. The danger of such and so numerous and so educated a body of citizens is sufficiently plain to the anxious forecasting of every devoted lover of our free and great Republic."

THE NEWER HISTORY OF THE OLDER WORLD.

BY PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, September 20, 1890.

For seventy years the monuments of Egypt, and for fifty years the monuments of Babylonia and Assyria, have been studied by a host of scholars, the peers of any others the world has known. M. Menant, of France, says that the texts already discovered would fill five hundred octavo volumes,—a larger amount than all the Greek and Latin classics. In Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Leyden, Upsala, and elsewhere, professorships of Egyptology and Assyriology have been long established. The permanent literature of these subjects, the sober, scientific works of these scholars issued in the past fifty years, would make a library by themselves. Wherever sound philological and historical study is honored, there the names of the great Egyptian and Assyrian scholars will be placed high in the list of those who have benefited their fellows.

On the surface of this great stream of discovery and scientific study there has been some froth and wreckage of wild assertion. Biblical and anti-biblical disputants have found secure vessels for their freight, only to prove them rotten trees. But froth and wreckage merely show the strength of the stream ; they neither make nor direct it. The immense value of this work arises from

the well-nigh numberless monuments discovered. These scholars give us the monuments and their story, so that the learner can compare the story with its source. If now we can ascertain the points on which these Egyptian and Assyrian scholars—French, English, German, Dutch, Italian, Swedish, Russian—are unanimously agreed, we may be sure there is good foundation for those points; and it is also certain that those points will represent the most scientific historical teaching of the present day concerning early man. Beyond the monuments all is, must be, mere speculation. The monuments form the horizon of all extra-biblical knowledge of early man. On the following four points there is unanimous agreement:

1. That with the earliest monuments man appears before us with language fully formed, and elaborate written characters responding to all his needs. Never afterwards in Babylonia or Egypt are the signs of language more beautifully shaped and chiselled than on the numerous diorite statues of Tello, or on the granite and limestone of the tablet of Senoferu, of the pyramids of Unas, Pepi, Mirinri, of the tomb of Ti. The long and many inscriptions of Tello and of the pyramids show us the language capable of expressing all religious thought, rich in the terms of settled, civilized, refined life, abundant in geographical names, and speaking of gold, iron, bronze, and precious woods and minerals, as of common possessions.

2. The earliest monuments show us the religions of Babylonia and Egypt already fully formed; their main fundamental doctrines remaining the same throughout the existence of their people, though with the centuries there were many changes in non-fundamental points. Up to 1880 there were many attempts to trace the evolution of the religion of Egypt; but by the opening of the inscribed pyramids in 1881 all historical ground was taken from these speculations,—for these inscriptions display all the main doctrines of the Egyptian religion fully elaborated. So that it is now agreed on all hands by the masters of these sciences that one must go behind all monuments, all historic proof, if he would attempt to trace the beginnings of Egyptian or Babylonian religion.

3. The art of Tello in Babylonia and of the pyramid times in Egypt was the highest art ever reached in these lands; their earliest art was their best. At this earliest period the numerous extant remains of their art show a mastery of all details, an ease

and grace of handling, a simplicity and truth to nature, a refinement of conception, and a deftness in execution never attained again in the later centuries of these peoples. The statues of Tello, the intaglios of early Chaldea, the statues and bas-reliefs of early Egypt, the pyramids, enormous in mass, yet with exquisitely finished, inscribed, painted inner passages and chambers; the tomb of Ti at Sakkarah, with its wealth of sharp-cut letters, and more abundant bas-reliefs of all the forms of most ancient home life, and many other tombs,—all tell the same story, that man at this era had reached the acme of the art of his people.

4. Language and religion fully formed, and art at its best, prove the fourth point,—that at the earliest age of man, shown by the monuments, a very high degree of civilization reigned in Babylonia and Egypt, and both these lands were intimately acquainted and in commercial exchange with the Sinaitic Peninsula and the Syrian-Phœnician coast. The earliest monument of Egypt is not found in Egypt, but in the Wady Magharah of the Sinaitic Peninsula, whither Senoferu had marched his forces to secure the copper and turquoise mines, and where he erected his tablet to commemorate that fact. The inscriptions on the pyramids are familiar with the products of inner Africa and the Syrian coast. The diorite, tons in weight, for the statues of Tello, as well as gold, etc., the inscriptions reiterate, were brought to the Euphrates from the Sinaitic Peninsula. To accomplish this, only two ways were open: by sea around Arabia,—a voyage of thirty-four hundred miles,—or across a fierce desert of eight hundred miles. These inscriptions are also familiar with the upper lands of the Euphrates and the Phœnician coast and their products. In other words, there was a much earlier and larger international exchange than has hitherto been supposed. And this conclusion from the monuments is corroborated by Virchow's classification of the crania of ancient peoples, which forces from him the conclusion that "archæologically we must attribute greater importance to international exchange in antiquity than we have hitherto."

Now, these points, soberly used, throw vast light upon the early chapters of Genesis, and harmonize completely with the Bible's references to those times. But there is one very singular demur—an application of the argument of silence to this plain story of the monuments. The criticism of the Bible which used to call itself

"higher," but now prefers the title of "historical criticism," gives us its history of these early times and men, but either studiously avoids or sneeringly refers to this monumental history and its scholars. "Historical criticism's" history, unfortunately, is not based on monuments; and, still more unfortunately, it is a contradiction of the history by monuments. If the history by monuments of early man is true, the fundamental assumptions of "historical criticism" cannot be true. If "historical criticism" is to justify its name, it is high time it made earnest work with the fast increasing number of the monuments of early man.

Rochester Theological Seminary.

CHRIST'S HUMILIATION.

BY REV. C. H. SPURGEON, MINISTER OF THE METROPOLITAN TABERNACLE, LONDON.

From The Golden Rule, Boston, October 2, 1890.

CHRIST might have been among those who are born in marble halls and robed in purple, but it was not so. You see Him at home at Nazareth, a carpenter's son, obedient to His parents, doing the little errands for the house like any other child. And there He dwelt in poverty with His parents, beginning life as a workman's boy. He veiled His Godhead beneath His childhood. He went up to Jerusalem, and there astonished the doctors by His answers, yet He went home with His parents and was subject to them. Then when He grew up, and the time for His appearing had come, how He humbled Himself! He did not knock at the door of the high priest, nor seek out the rabbis and learned scribes, but He made companions of fishermen from the lake, infinitely His inferiors, even if we regard Him simply as a man. Publicans and sinners drew near to hear Him, and when they gathered round Him, and when little children stood and listened to Him, then He poured out the fulness of His heart, for "He humbled Himself."

This was not the deepest humiliation; He allowed the devil to tempt Him. I have often wondered at this. His pure mind was right loyal; how can He bear contact with the prince of darkness and father of lies? Would Christ allow Satan to put Him to the test? He did; and spotless purity had to bear contact with infamous villainy.

Personally, in His own body. He suffered weakness, hunger, thirst; in His own mind He suffered rebuke, contumely, falsehood. He was constantly the man of sorrows. He was belied, called a glutton and a wine-bibber, and His miracles were ascribed to the help of Beelzebub.

Notice, now, the rule of His descent. "He humbled Himself, and became obedient." I have known of persons trying to humble themselves by will-worship. I have stood by the side of a monk's bed when he was not in it, and I have seen the whip with which he flagellated himself. That was his way of humbling himself. Our Lord's way of humiliation was by obedience. He invented no strange way of making Himself ridiculous. He put upon Himself no singular garb that would draw attention to His poverty, but simply obeyed His God, and there is no humility like obedience. While here, He was always subservient to the Father's great purpose; He came to do the will of Him that sent Him, and to finish His work. He did the will of God also obediently by following out what He knew to be the Father's great design in sending Him. He was sent to save, and He went about seeking to save that which was lost. When we get into unison with God, when we wish what He wishes, when we live for the great object of God, then we shall be truly humble.

Now what was at the bottom of that abyss to which He descended? It was death. He was obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Our Lord went to the death still obedient. He died willingly, but at the same time He died obediently. He waited until His hour was come, when He was able to say, "It is finished"; then He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. Oh, what a death was His! It was even the death of the cross, which was a violent death and an extremely painful death. He died in pain most exquisite, both of body and of soul. It was also a death most shameful. Thieves were crucified with Him; the death was one for slaves, for the basest of mankind. No Roman citizen might be put to death in such a way as that; it was a mean death. He died not like a hero in battle; He died as a criminal, upon the gallows-tree of Calvary. He humbled Himself even to this.

From all this let us learn to imitate our Lord in His humility, His obedience and His self-denial. Let us hate the sin that brought upon Him this humiliation, and let us be filled with a burning desire to honor Him. Every time He seems to put

away the crown, let us put it on His head. Every time we hear Him slandered, let us speak up for Him. "Soldiers of Christ, arise." Proclaim Him King, and boldly say that His word is infallible, and that His precious blood alone can atone for sin.

NEWMAN AND DÖLLINGER CONTRASTED.*

BY RT. REV. A. C. COXE, D.D., BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, September 27, 1890.

THE decease, at an advanced age, of John Henry Newman, once the brilliant vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, and the delight of Oriel College, closes a period of Anglican history to which I must devote a few words in a spirit of tender regret, but with fidelity to truth. While yet an under-graduate I became acquainted with some of his work, then first attracting attention beyond the little world of his university. He was charged, even then, with unfaithfulness to his position, but so strong were his utterances against Roman corruptions that I gave to the spell of his genius the assent of a disciple, and for a time he dictated his ideas to my confiding thought almost with despotic sway. The movement, of which he was not the author, and which he proved incapable of controlling, derived, nevertheless, a peculiar charm from his fine poetic feeling and from what seemed to me his surpassing piety. For a long time I refused to believe that "Tract No. 90" proceeded from his pen. It was diametrically counter to other statements of doctrine which were confessedly his, and it was tainted with a moral obliquity utterly inconsistent with my conceptions of his exalted character. To "palter, in a double sense," about formulas which one has solemnly accepted in their grammatical force, as expounded by the Common Prayer, and by other contemporary standards (recognized for three centuries as their legitimate interpreters), seemed to me a crime which it was cruel to attribute to so good a man. I resented the idea, as one would resent a charge of perjury brought by momentary caprice against a friend of spotless integrity. When the fact became known I no longer read his words with satisfaction. Could he be in-

tentionally weaving ambiguities to entrap young and ardent admirers into sophistical and dangerous, if not dishonorable, dealings with conscience and with men? I remember the unspeakable anguish with which I turned away from him as a guide, while even then I believed he was only momentarily untrue to his better nature, and would recover himself, like St. Peter.

The astounding news of his final downfall overwhelmed my soul; I writhed in pain almost physical when I learned of it. Had he interposed a sober period of retirement to convince himself and friends that he was weighing the tremendous nature of his revolt against all that had claims upon his love and gratitude—not to speak of what should have been the conduct of an honorable man—one could have wept for him and yet been able to bless him and love him and sympathize with his struggle and its catastrophe. But no! his "Apologia" does not mitigate the nature of his deed; his secession was the betrayal of a trust the most sacred which any man can assume. It broke the hearts of confiding friends, the purest and the best that God could give to a fellow-traveller through this bad world. And worst of all, he wrecked the faith and hopes and the life work of many precious youth who had given him their unsuspecting confidence and who followed him into a quagmire where all that was of promise in their intellect and character has been swallowed up and lost to their age and to the best interests of humanity. The distress and misery with which their ruin clouded the remaining days of fathers and mothers, and broke up families and the happiness of homes, is unutterable. If there be a woe against those "by whom offences come," one trembles to reflect upon the career of Newman.

But, happily, we who know not the infirmities, mental and moral, with which his judgment was distracted and his conduct made fanatically inconsistent, have no right to judge the erring brother; though it is cowardly and untrue to duty if we fail to condemn his deeds. How tenderly the outraged Church of England, how maternally his university, how generously his smitten friends have dealt with their lost companion and beloved brother is known to all. It furnishes an example of forbearance the most unparalleled. Almost to the point of weakness they have practically forgotten everything but the fact that he once was theirs; their "own mother's son." All that made him great was his Anglican life and training; all that lasts of his life-work

* Extract from Bishop Coxe's address to the Council of his diocese, at Niagara Falls, Sept. 16, 1890.

belongs to his Oxford days. Throw a veil over the rest.

It has been justly said that his peculiar turn of mind enabled him to convince himself of anything. The holy shirt of Treves, the winking Madonna, the liquefaction of the blood at Naples, he could accept as a foregone conclusion and argue up to it with infinite ingenuity. As a barrister he could have taken the most desperate case on his hands and persuaded himself that his client was strong in the justice of his plea. In short, he was the victim of his own plausibility. He nauseated the morality of Liguori and swallowed it. He regretted the new dogmas and subscribed to them. He lamented much that disgraced the Roman Church, but took his seat in the College of Cardinals, where the debauched Antonelli had so long reigned supreme. Pio Nono accepted him as an adherent, but the Jesuits were too cunning to let him be made Cardinal until they had forced the dogma of infallibility upon the Roman obedience. What an enigma his character must remain! God only knows its solution. But a true Catholic may be permitted to class him with Tertullian; to treasure what he gave us of his gold, and to burn his chaff with fire.

We may love him yet, and weep for all that he might have been. But no soldier of the cross who loves the cause of Christ and follows "the noble army of martyrs" with unshaken loyalty to their example can dissemble the fact that if they were faithful to the truth of God, he most assuredly was not.

I know how fashionable it is to confound truth and error by indiscriminate eulogy, when one speaks of individuals whom the world finds it convenient to praise. But, I am a Christian bishop, devoted to Catholic standards of right and wrong, and bound to bear my testimony as to truth, leaving men and motives to the only Judge of all. The Reformation in England preserved our Catholicity, saving us from the innumerable manufactured articles of Roman credulity. To that event the Anglo-Saxon race owes all that distinguishes it from the Latin races in Italy, in Spain, in Portugal, in Mexico, and Brazil. But if the career which I have criticised was true to God, to the Scriptures, to the Creeds, and to the Gospel in its purity, then that Reformation was a curse, and not our blessing and our glory. If Newman was right, then the martyrs of Oxford and Smithfield were criminals, and those who deluged France with the blood of St. Bartholomew's Day were saints of God, and blessed was the *Te Deum* which

the Pope sang in Rome to praise the Most High for a massacre that astounded the world. Mary, the bloody, should have reigned as long as did Elizabeth, and her husband, Don Philip, should have sent the Duke of Alva to England to duplicate the cruelties with which he decimated populations in the Netherlands and horrified mankind. Yes, and the inquisition should have been established in London as it was in Madrid, and the Armada, which God dashed to pieces after the Pope had blessed it, should have been permitted to reduce our forefathers to the abject estate of the populations of nearly all the Latin colonies in America. We should have been at best either a nation of Atheists, like reactionary France, or a population of zealots, crouching to kiss the foot of the Roman Pontiff, and accepting his "*Syllabus*" as the definite character of humanity to be the slaves of ignorance, the dupes of imposture, and the tools of despotism. In a word, Newman himself owed all that gave him infinite superiority over all his comrades of the Roman curia to that very Reformation which made England and Oxford what they have been ever since. He could never have been the Newman that he once was but for all that he abandoned when he ceased to be the Newman of St. Mary's.

In judging of a life work, then, we are forced to inquire, was it faithful to humanity and to God? In a word, was it a testimony to the sovereignty of truth? If not, the man may have been himself the victim of honest delusions, but his life was a lie.

And all this, while it allows for the sincerity of an errorist, becomes a tribute to those who have suffered through fidelity to right against cruel wrong. This century has seen no nobler spectacle than that of the illustrious Dollinger, the Antipas of Latin Christendom; the acknowledged chieftain of thought and scholarship in Roman schools; the intrepid witness to Catholic orthodoxy against the brazen arrogance of Pio Nono and the "*Council of Sacristans*," which surrendered the faith of ages to his assumption of infallibility. Honor to the memory of him who, to all threats and to all flatteries and to the menace of eternal damnation, always and to the last of life made answer: "I cannot subscribe to what I know to be untrue." Honor to the Abdiel of the enslaved churches! At this moment the Bishops of Holland, with the Old Catholic Bishops of Germany and Switzerland, are assembled on the banks of the Rhine to take up his testimony and energize it for the regeneration of those churches

that composed the "Holy Roman Empire," in which the Emperor and the Pontiff were rival lords. Out of this was created the "Roman Catholic Church,"—a thing unknown to antiquity, and in its present form an establishment more recent than those of Luther and Calvin. The Prayer-Book of the Church of England is older than the creed of the Council of Trent; and when we say in the ancient creed of undivided Christendom that we believe in the "Holy Catholic Church," let us mean what we say, and be "ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason." All this is what the heroic life and death of Döllinger should make clear to enlightened men. As to the contrasted history of Newman, the best comment is that of St. Vincent of Lerins, speaking of the brilliant and illustrious Tertullian. He argued that when a great teacher and guide falls away, we are to remember that truth is not to be judged of by men, but all men are to be weighed and measured by the unchangeable standard of truth, and truth means no novelty, but what "from the beginning, everywhere, and by all the churches," has been known and held as the Faith once delivered to the saints.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

II.

RENTED PEWS.

BY THE REV. GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER,
D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH,
NEW YORK.

WE are not disposed to reason with men who talk about things in the abstract, when we undertake to write on the subject of church support. In the matter of church support, we are unable to legislate on any higher plane than practical efficiency will warrant. I freely admit that the ideal church is one sufficiently endowed to have all of its sittings declared free to worshippers. Very few of our churches have any endowment. For the vast majority of our churches the problem of support is simply this, how best to secure from the regular worshippers a steady income sufficient

for all needs. Dismissing, therefore, all theory, discarding all ideals, let us discuss this problem in a common-sense, business-like way.

In my judgment, for an unendowed parish church in a city or a community, where worshippers at the principal services attend in sufficient numbers to fill all the sittings, this support can best be secured by renting the pews. In country places, or in parishes of the city where regular attendants do not fill the church, and where the services are attended by the same people throughout the whole year, the question of renting pews, or making them free, and soliciting subscriptions by envelope, is not a serious one. The results are the same in either case. The same people will occupy the same pews, and the envelope pledge will be an exact substitute for the weekly amount of pew rent. But in churches where, for summer months, a large portion of the congregation is absent, and during winter months the regular congregation fill the pews, the rental of pews will always prove the most satisfactory, and always provide the most regular and plentiful support.

The advantages of pew rents over free churches are these: they enable families to sit together—a great consideration for the children; they insure a steady revenue at a season of the year when parishioners in large numbers are absent; they enable a vestry to forecast with some degree of certainty the probable income, and then wisely to provide for the annual expenses; they relieve the rector from a vast amount of worry, and the people from unusual and constant solicitations; they furnish the opportunity for giving to charities and missions through the offertory.

Fully conceding that if a church is free from debt, and provided with ample endowment for all its expenses, that it would be a selfish thing for such a church to rent its pews, I am prepared to maintain that for a church not free from debt and without other means of support than the offerings of its people, renting pews is in every way desirable, and in no way whatever unchristian.

As between renting a pew for a fixed sum and asking a pledge for a fixed sum there is no difference. As for giving the use of a pew for a consideration and assigning a pew for a consideration there is no difference. My own experience justifies me in saying that there have been no less troubles arising from want of courtesy and reasonable consideration of strangers' rights in a free church, than in one the pews of which are rented.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE. By HENRY FORRESTER. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889. Pp. 86, 8vo, cloth, \$1.00.

This book is an attempt to show how an ecclesiastical unity of the Protestant churches in this country might be accomplished on the basis of the Declaration of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, put forth in 1886. The scope of that declaration is practically limited to the field of American Protestantism, leaving aside the broader question of union with the Greek and Roman Churches. And yet even within this narrower range the document itself raises an obstacle to unity which seems almost insurmountable. That obstacle appears in the fourth term of communion, the acceptance of the historic episcopate. For this, taken as it stands, means that all non-episcopal churches must acknowledge the invalidity of the ordination of their clergy, and agree to their reordination at the hands of the bishops. How can this obstacle be overcome? It is this question which this book is written to answer. It accordingly endeavors, first of all, to see whether reordination is so essential to church unity as the Episcopalians generally suppose. The writer reviews briefly the acts and canons of the Councils of the Church in the first four centuries, in order to obtain their testimony on the two points of the indelibility of orders and the treatment of the separatists. As to the first point his investigation leads him to conclude that the only indelibility of orders which the Primitive Church recognized was "that a man having once been rightly ordained would never need to be ordained again to the same office. If he should be deposed he lost the power bestowed upon him at his ordination, and if he were restored, he would receive it again without a new ordination." As to the second point, while the action of the Nicene Council with reference to the Novatians is matter of dispute, there is no question as to the action taken by later councils in the cases of the Donatists and other separatists. In all these cases the possession of orders by the separated sects was denied by the Councils, and yet upon restoration to the Church their bishops and clergy were received without reordination. Upon what principle, then, was this course adopted? Not on the principle of indelibility of orders, nor on that of retrospective validity, but on the truer principle of "the plenary authority and power of the Church." It is Christ's spirit which

animates the Church and gives her authority and power to do whatever is best suited to advance her mission and work. Whatever the Church as a whole recognizes is for that very reason valid and effectual. The early Church did not regard the *manual act* of the bishop as essential to ordination, although his *authority* was respected as that of the governing member of the Church. Thus the form of ordination was not the essential thing, but the recognition of the ordination by the Church. It is this principle of the authority of the Church which the writer of this book proposes as the key to Protestant unity through the American Episcopal Church. Let that Church exercise *her* authority to do what is best for the cause of Christianity, and so interpret the declaration of her bishops as to receive all fit Protestant ministers without reordination, who will accept her doctrine, discipline and worship. This is asking no more than what she already does in the case of Roman clerics. For, as the writer shows, the consecration of the first Roman bishop for this country was against canon law, and was therefore null and void, and invalidates all orders conferred in that line. Yet Roman clerics are received without reordination, and by their simple reception are given all the powers of the ministry of the Church. And such a reception would do the same for Protestant ministers, notwithstanding their lack of "episcopal ordination." The way would thus be cleared for their union with the Protestant Episcopal Church, who by her simple, inherent authority would solve the whole difficult problem of a united American Christianity.

The book is clearly and interestingly written, and seems to offer the only practical escape from the embarrassing position into which the Declaration of the Bishops has brought the Episcopal Church by professing to concede so much for the sake of unity, and yet conceding really nothing at all. But the traditions of episcopacy are so strongly rooted that it will be long before the bishops and their Church as a whole can be brought to treat non-episcopal churches so generously and unselfishly. We think the book is weak in its assumption of the necessity, desirability, and possibility of organic church unity. Christian unity is undoubtedly all that, but Christian unity and church unity are two very different things. The author, however, deserves commendation for his careful use of historical data, his frank acknowledgment of difficulties, the justice of his conclusions, and his earnest, irenical spirit.

H. RICHARD HARRIS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE POETRY OF JOB. By GEORGE H. GILBERT, Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1889. Pp. xiv., 224, \$1.

A scholarly young minister, who, however, had unfortunately neglected his Hebrew, once asked us to recommend to him a readable work on the Book of Job, which would dispense with technical exegesis and yet give him a fair understanding of the thought and style of what he had been taught to regard as the world's greatest poem. We did the best we could for him at the time, recommending such monographs as *The Argument of the Book of Job Unfolded*, by Dr. William Henry Green, to be supplemented by such briefer essays as the eighth chapter of *The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, by Isaac Taylor. But we informed him that he had described a real desideratum in biblical literature, and that no work then known to us would meet just the need that he felt. If we were asked the same question now, we should reply without hesitation that Professor Gilbert's book answered the purpose exactly. Though based upon thorough study of the original, and utilizing the most recent results of philological research, the book is a popular one throughout, and seems to have been written chiefly for readers of the English Bible. The translation is at once so faithful and striking, and the treatment which follows is so brief and skilful, that the average student of Scripture can gain from it a more adequate conception of "this greatest product of the Hebrew mind" than can be gotten in the same length of time from any other translation or treatise that we have ever seen.

The work is divided into two parts, each occupying about a hundred pages. The first is a rhythmical translation of Job. The Revised Version of this book was a great improvement upon the Common Version, the changes being as numerous and important, perhaps, as in any part of the Old Testament, and one obvious feature of that superiority was its preservation of the Hebrew parallelism. Professor Gilbert's translation, however, preserves not only the parallelism of the original, but also the movement by tones. Most of the Hebrew lines in Job have three tones, the only important exceptions being the occasional two-toned and four-toned lines. In every case the English lines are here made to correspond. For instance, in the familiar passage of 3: 17, the three-toned lines of the Hebrew are rendered into three-toned English lines, thus:

"The wicked have ceased there from troubling,
And there are the weary at rest."

But in no case has he sacrificed the sense to either rhythm or sentiment. Doubtless it is an ungracious task to correct renderings which are endeared by sacred associations to thousands of devout readers, but Professor Gilbert, like the Victorian revisers, promptly parts company with our venerable version whenever it is unintelligible or misleading. There will, of course, be no objection to this in the case of such absurd translations as those of the old version in 26: 5 and 31: 35, because they do not state any important general truth. But it is far otherwise with such a passage as 13: 15, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him," for this, though not a correct rendering of this particular passage, has been a comfort and stay to many a soul when near to death. But Professor Gilbert, following the American Committee and the margin of R. V., renders thus:

"Behold, he will slay me: I hope not:
But my ways I will prove to his face."

The only objection to this is the ambiguity of the clause, "I hope not." It may mean, "I hope that he will not slay me," and it will be so taken by most English readers, whereas the meaning that our author wished to convey is just the opposite of this—viz., I do not hope, I have no hope. Some of his renderings are less accurate than those of R. V., but the great majority of them are better than those of either of our current versions; and, on the whole, it is not too much to say that this is the best translation of Job in the English language.

The second part of the book is the Interpretation of the Poem, consisting of five chapters, the first giving a brief analysis of Job, the theme, the characters, and the development of the poem; the remaining four being occupied with comparative criticism, the poet's conceptions of God, and his references to Human Life, Animal Life, and Nature, being compared with those found in Homer, Dante, Shakspeare, and Milton. One specimen of the vivid style of his interpretations must suffice, 38: 12-14:

"Hast thou ever commanded a morning?
Hast shown to a dawning its place,
To lay hold of the corners of earth,
That thence may be shaken the wicked?
It [the earth] changes as signet-clay,
So that things appear as a garment."

"Night spreads a blanket over the earth. Morn comes, and, seizing the corners of this vast blanket, lifts it, and shakes the wicked out of its thick folds. Earth, smitten by the dawn, is transfigured. What but a moment ago was formless clay shows now a clear and divine impress. The mountains and hills and valleys stand forth with sharply cut outlines—the beauteous garment of the earth."

Vigorous and graphic expositions like this occur on every page, and, though not concerned primarily with the religious teachings of the poem, they do unquestionably make its spiritual lessons more effectual by enhancing the beauty and significance of their literary setting.

W. W. MOORE.

HAMPDEN SIDNEY, VA.

CHRISTIAN THEISM. By the Rev. C. A. ROW, M.A. New York: Thomas Whittaker (1890). Pp. viii., 318, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

CHRISTIAN THEISM: ITS CLAIMS AND SANCTIONS. By D. P. PURINGTON, LL.D. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. vii., 303, 8vo, \$1.75.

Canon Row's work is addressed to plain common sense and not to the professional philosopher. Novelty is not aimed at. The aim is to give a brief and popular exposition of the argument for theism, and to consider the objections which are commonly urged. As such exposition the work is highly to be commended. The presentation is lucid and the temper of the work is perfect. The nature of the evidence is first dwelt upon with the aim of warding off false expectations, and the difficulties arising from agnosticism are briefly considered. The argument then takes the familiar road. The argument from causation and from adaptation is presented, and the bearing of evolution upon the argument from adaptation is discussed. These arguments are then illustrated at length in a very simple and striking way. In this field the author has much of the vividness and force of Paley. The argument is next carried into the moral field, and the theistic and anti-theistic

positions are compared in their bearing on life and character. Various popular objections are also considered, chiefly drawn from dysteleology and the facts of physical and moral evil. Of course the author does not remove the difficulty, but he shows clearly that the matter has been rhetorically exaggerated. When the problem is reduced to its lowest terms there is still much mystery remaining, but we are worse off if, declining the theistic position, we have recourse to atheism. Then all is opaque and unintelligible, and the hope for a better solution, which is rational in theism, vanishes into despair. The work closes with a survey of the argument for life after death.

In a work like this the author is not to be judged too critically. A profounder metaphysics would confuse and mislead; and we may well believe that for another audience many things would be differently put. A single criticism, however, seems in place. In the argument from adaptation the alternative is too exclusively represented as a doctrine of chance. This is probably the case with popular atheism, but it is not true of the atheism which has sprung up in connection with scientific speculation. The notion of law which has taken possession of modern thought vacates all appeals to chance, and compels us to view every event as the necessary outcome of the system, so that whoever could have read the system at any point in its history would have seen every present event as potentially present, to the exclusion of all other possibilities. This fact disposes of all atheisms based on chance and time; for, given the system and its laws, all its products to the remotest future are also given. But the same fact disposes of theistic argument based on probabilities. There never was a system of trial and rejection or a blind and aimless shuffling which by good luck hit upon something which looked like intelligence. If there are any ends in the system, they are essential in the system. No necessary system can mount above itself or make new and groundless departures. Hence atheism must seek to rest in the system itself as a self-enclosed and self-executing necessity; and theism, on the other hand, must seek to show that the system is second and not first, derived and not ultimate. Arguments from natural selection and that sort of thing are hopelessly irrelevant as aids to unfaith.

Dr. Purinton's work is a more ambitious production than that of Canon Row. There is an appearance of careful analysis. The subject is treated under many more heads than appear in the canon's work. Rigorous argumentative forms are often introduced. There is also a disquisition upon the intuitions in addition to all the marks of wide reading. And yet the canon's book seems the more satisfactory. The canon does not "strive nor cry," while a certain agonistic air is manifest throughout the doctor's treatise. The author's abundance of words also leaves us a little in doubt at times as to his exact thought. This is well illustrated in the following titles of chapters: Intelligence in Nature; or, the Eutaxiological Argument; Volition in Nature; or, the Teleological Argument; The Personality of God; or, the Intuitive Argument; The Goodness of God; or, the Historical Argument; The Unity of God; or, the Monistic Argument, and Infinity of God; or, the Causal Argument. One would hardly gather from the titles that the first chapter treats of order in nature, and that the second treats of design. But design is certainly as clear a mark of intelligence as order is; and if volition have anything to do with nature, it must as certainly be displayed in

the laws of nature, which are all contingent, so far as we know, as in the details of design. Choice in Nature would come nearer the idea intended. Again in the Personality of God, or the Intuitive Argument, it is hard to see how the argument for the divine personality is any more intuitive than the argument, say, for divine causality. If the argument is from intuitions, both alike are intuitive. If the argument is for intuitions, there is no need of argument; for intuitions stand in their own right. The author opens this chapter with a discussion of the nature of intuitions which seems to stand in no vital relation to the rest of it. The result is thus expressed: "We have found within us the self-evident, necessary, and universal conviction of an original, superhuman, personal spirit without us. This spirit, of course, is recognized as self-conscious and free." This conclusion is certainly not warranted by the preceding discussion, and it certainly is not recognized by the mass of theistic writers. Indeed, why argue through 300 pages for the existence of God when we "have within us the self-evident, necessary, and universal conviction of an original, superhuman, personal spirit without us"? In like manner the title, the Goodness of God; or, the Historical Argument, seems to suggest that the goodness of God is confined to history. The Infinity of God; or, the Causal Argument, is equally confusing. In spite of elaborate analysis and of great apparent thoroughness, the author seems not to have had a really clear conception of the essential argument and of the mutual relations of its several forms. But works on theism are valuable less for the speculative adequacy and logical cogency of the argument than for the illustration of the theistic faith already possessed, and for the removal of the crude objections to that faith which abound in superficial thinking. In this respect the work in hand is valuable. We will only add that it must have been a slip of the pen which put Aristotle and Spinoza (p. 92) among the believers in chance.

BORDEN P. BOWNE.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MUHLBERG. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON, D.D. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 267, 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

This book resembles the sermon of the man who put everything he knew into it for fear that he should leave something out. The attempt is made to tell the story of the career and mission of Dr. Muhlenberg within 267 pages, and still give the writer the chance to disport himself hither and thither like a colt in a ten-acre lot. The book has great promise as one opens it and begins to read, and it has some very fine qualities, but one goes through it with a growing sense of dissatisfaction, and closes it with the regret that Dr. Newton had not put a severer check upon his frolicsomeness, and told us what Dr. Muhlenberg really was and what he did, rather than given us a series of dissolving views concerning him. This great man was second to almost no other of the leading men in the Episcopal Church who have now passed away. He ranks with Bishop White, Bishop Hobart, Bishop Doane, Bishop Alonzo Potter, and the late Dr. De Koven, as one of the men who had insight and outreaching purpose, and who saw in the Episcopal Church something beyond the ecclesiastical partisanship which has been too commonly employed in exercising its functions. Each one of these men did a great and an organizing work, but Dr. Muhlenberg

did something more. He moved in advance of others. He anticipated what was coming. He saw how his own communion could be developed upon broad and catholic lines, and the two qualities of insight and breadth were notably conspicuous in all that he said or did. He was a great educator. He led the Church in the movement for parish development. He sounded the depths of the whole question of Christian unity in America in the memorial which he sent to the House of Bishops in 1853, and he was among the first to build up within the Episcopal communion the social and philanthropic institutions which have given this Church favor in the eyes of all men. It is in mapping out and presenting to the public anew these great and distinctive features of Dr. Muhlenberg's life-work that Dr. Newton has made his monograph successful and valuable. It is in the working out of details and in the introduction of irrelevant matter that he chiefly fails to meet our expectations. Into these deficiencies it is not worth while, however, to enter, because we cannot change or improve them. The book itself contains nearly all that one needs to know about this prophetic man, and its material is so well arranged that one can easily comprehend the qualities which made him strong and great. Dr. Newton had some wonderfully good material to work up in this biography. Miss Annie Ayres has written the biography of Dr. Muhlenberg in full, but she did the work from a woman's point of view. She laid little or no emphasis upon the points in which he manifested true leadership. She presented the facts, but had not the literary skill to touch them with the right sort of emphasis. Dr. Newton has performed just this service, and this will give his book a reading where the other volume will be unnoticed. It is on this account that we regret all the more the inaccuracies and the errors of taste which disfigure his production. Dr. Newton has brought out with some distinctness the present bearing of the Memorial Movement initiated by Dr. Muhlenberg upon the present life of the Episcopal Church, but he gives us only enough knowledge of it to create the thirst for more. The whole work and influence of Dr. Muhlenberg allows of a larger, more comprehensive, and more spiritual treatment than Dr. Newton has attempted, and the interest in him both within and without the Episcopal Church will yet compel the writing of his biography by a more competent person than any who have yet attempted it. He was one of the few men who have the prophetic instinct in any age, and are able to inspire their fellow-men with the truths which they most need. The part which Bishop Alonzo Potter and Bishop George Burgess had in the Memorial Movement was hardly less important than that which was played by Dr. Muhlenberg himself, and the leaving out of these two prelates from the story of this effort to reach a larger life is almost like telling the story of "Hamlet" and forgetting to assign his friend Horatio a place in it. One is glad to recognize what is good in this monograph, but it is impossible to do so without the constant feeling that the treatment comes short of what the subject demands.

BOSTON, MASS.

JULIUS H. WARD.

THE HISTORICAL CHRIST, THE MORAL POWER OF HISTORY. The Bedell Lectures for 1889. By Rev. DAVID H. GREER, D.D., rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1890. Pp. 94, \$1.

This is a small book on a big subject. It con-

sists of two lectures, one on the "Historical Christ" and the other on "Christ the Moral Power of History," the second growing naturally out of the first; delivered on the Bedell foundation before the institutions at Gambier, O. It is not pretended that there is anything new either in the subject-matter or in the arguments used to illustrate and enforce it. The ground has been traversed over and over again. Not to speak of the scores of recent lives of Christ, from Paulus to Edersheim, the particular phase of the subject presented in these lectures has received frequent and in some cases masterly treatment. In his recorded conversations with Montholon, Napoleon is reported to have said, *inter alia*, "Between Him [Christ] and anything of this world there is no possible term of comparison." Then, not to go beyond our own language and country, we have that inimitable tenth chapter of Dr. Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, entitled "The Character of Jesus Forbids His Possible Classification with Men;" Dr. J. W. Alexander's admirable lecture before the University of Virginia on "The Character of Jesus Christ an Argument for the Divine Origin of Christianity," and Dr. Schaff's interesting volume on *The Person of Christ*. The subject of the second of Dr. Greer's lectures has been treated, among others in this country, by Dr. N. L. Rice in Lecture XV. of the University of Virginia course, "On the Moral Effects of Christianity;" by C. L. Brace, in his *Gesta Christi*, and still more recently by Dr. R. S. Storrs in his massive and elegant volume on *The Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by Its Historical Effects*. We have no room to mention here even the names of British and Continental writers, especially German, on the same great subject.

From this brief survey it will be seen that it required no inconsiderable courage and confidence in himself for a lecturer to venture upon ground thus occupied. But Dr. Greer seems to have been equal to the task he imposed upon himself. Without setting up any claim to novelty or new discoveries, he is fresh, interesting, and original in the only sense in which originality is possible on such a theme. He makes his own independent use of his materials in a style at once free, natural, and elegant, and with a warmth of feeling which must have made his lectures interesting and profitable to the students at Gambier, for whom they were specially prepared.

The gist of the argument in the first lecture is briefly this: The character of Jesus Christ as portrayed in the Gospels is a *fact*. Whatever theory men may advocate or adopt concerning it, its existence as a fact remains; there it stands; it can be neither evaded nor denied. How can it be accounted for? Pilate's question, "What shall I do with Jesus which is called Christ?" is still before the world. The author, who shows a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, both ancient and modern, disposes of the mythical theory of Strauss, the legendary theory of Renan, and the theory of a personification of an artistic or poetical ideal, which has had some recent advocates, especially in Germany, as all of them equally unsatisfactory and untenable. The simplest and easiest, and in fact the only possible solution of the problem, is the truth of the narrative in the Gospels, and the actual historical character of the Christ. This explains all, and when admitted it is at once seen that most of the difficulties are of men's own making.

In the second lecture the author shows that Christ Himself is the dominant factor in human

history. Other elements enter, but they are secondary and subordinate. For nearly nineteen centuries "the righteousness of Christ has energized history, producing revolutions and working out evolutions like nothing else which history discloses." In spite of imperfections and drawbacks occasioned by our sinful humanity, the Christ of history has been and is the Moral Power pervading and leavening the world's progress. Jesus Christ and Him crucified is "the old, old story," ever new. No other question is so irresistibly attractive even to the world's best minds as the ancient query, "What think ye of Christ?" The world can never hear enough of Him. Men want salvation, and the Gospel of the Son of God is still, and ever will be, the wisdom of God and the power of God unto the salvation of every one that believeth.

We had marked a number of passages for quotation, as specimens of the author's happy way of putting things, but our limits forbid us that pleasure. We cannot in honesty forbear to mention the only passage in the book to which we take exception. On page 57 the author says: "The primitive man, as far as we know anything about him at all, albeit an innocent, was a very ignoble creature, and is so represented in the Bible, sensuous and superstitious, with but little enlightenment and power of self-control, making a fetch out of a serpent and yielding at once to the simplest form of temptation addressed to his bodily appetites." This, we submit, is not the kind of man Adam was, as described in the Bible, and he is about the only "primitive man" we know anything about. According to the Bible he was not an "ignoble," semi-brutal savage, "sensuous and superstitious," but a full-grown man, perfect of his kind, created in the image of God. If that is not the true account of the origin of man, who then can tell us anything about it?

With this single exception we commend this little book as an interesting and eloquent presentation of one phase of the great argument for the truth of Christianity.

WILLIAM ALEXANDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

THE CHURCH IN THY HOUSE. Daily Family Prayers for Morning and Evening. By Rev. RUFUS W. CLARK, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Detroit. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 120, 12mo, cloth, 60 cents.

This is a liturgy for the home. It includes Scripture selections and prayers for the morning and evening worship for four weeks. The Scripture readings are given in full for the first four weeks, and then in the idea that the prayers will be repeated. Other Scripture selections are referred to by chapter and verse for three more months. A few special prayers are given at the close of the volume.

Few will deny that a liturgy is generally more needed for the home than it is for the church. There are in every congregation many households which are without daily family worship because the head of the house cannot bring himself to lead in such a service. For such cases a book of this kind may be just what is needed to relieve the difficulty. With such a book a faithful pastor may secure the establishment of family worship in many a home where otherwise there would be no such service. The need of such a book has long been felt, and a number of volumes have been published to meet this need. Some of these volumes are too elaborate and too costly to become

generally useful. "The Church in Thy House" is a small book and inexpensive. The prayers are simple, fresh, comprehensive, and spiritual. We have noticed only a few expressions to which we take exception. On p. 6, "Make us know those sins that are displeasing to thee," seems to imply that there may be some sins which are not displeasing to God. On p. 8, "Thou hast been our Creator," is a common mistake of tense; the past tense being wrongly used where the perpetual present is required; it should be, "Thou art our Creator." On p. 41, "The day is gone; we give thanks, O Lord," raises the question whether we are to give thanks for the flight of time. But these are small defects, and from such the book as a whole is singularly free. If it should be the means of establishing family worship in many households this modest volume will accomplish a great purpose.

THOMAS S. HASTINGS.

NEW YORK

YALE LECTURES ON PREACHING AND OTHER WRITINGS. By NATHANIEL J. BURTON, D.D., Pastor of the Park Church, Hartford, Conn. Edited by Richard E. Burton. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co.; London: Chatto & Windus. Svo, cloth, \$3.75; to ministers, \$3.

From the preface we learn that the lectures on preaching, which occupy the larger part of this volume, and of which there are twenty, were delivered at the Yale Theological Seminary, twelve of them in the Lyman Beecher course of 1884, and the remainder as special lectures in the years 1885 and 1886. Before the lectures there are given to us the addresses delivered at the funeral of Dr. Burton, at the Park Church, October 17th, 1887. These are by President Dwight, Dr. J. H. Twichell, and Dr. E. P. Parker. These addresses give us a high estimate of the mind and of the spirit of Dr. Burton. Evidently he was a man of deep convictions, of generous spirit, of warm affections, and of high courage. President Dwight says: "The richness of his thinking, the tenderness of his feeling, the kindness of his spirit toward all around him, the earnestness of his working for the good of men, have all been more and more infused with the influence of a living faith in the Divine Master who long since called him into His service and His spiritual kingdom." From these funeral addresses one is prepared to expect much of freshness and vigor in the lectures, and we are by no means disappointed. These twenty lectures cover a great deal of ground both in homiletics and in pastoral theology, but they are quite unique and unconventional. There is nothing here like an attempt to present an orderly system, such as we find in the many books on homiletics. Yet these lectures are full of suggestions and practical hints, fresh and striking, and given always in a singularly forcible way, and in a style that reminds one of the free and bold rhetoric with which Dr. Bushnell expressed his thoughts. We had not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Burton, or of having seen or heard him. But we feel after reading these lectures that we have been communing in a very personal way with a man of rare gifts, bold and brilliant and manly. He has a way of putting things which is often very striking. He asserts his liberty to think for himself and to speak out his thought in his own way, impressing one with the strength of his individuality. He has small patience with any pretension or sham. Evidently he has no great respect for any rules of homiletics which might cramp manly liberty in

methods of preaching. The lectures are singularly free from the traditional and the conventional, and therefore they are all the more suggestive and stimulating. We could not recommend these lectures as a text-book for a theological seminary, but we can recommend theological students to read them. More manliness in the ministry the times are needing, and we have rarely met with any book on homiletics, in a wide reading in this department, so well calculated as this to promote the highest Christian manliness.

The lectures are followed by eight addresses and these by nine sermons, which are fresh and striking in thought and in style, and which have been published without the author's revision. We are attracted and moved by the originality and force which we see in these productions, and are quite willing to overlook some infelicities of style in our enjoyment of the manly and devout spirit which speaks to us so directly and so personally that we seem to have been conversing with the author.

THOMAS S. HASTINGS.

NEW YORK.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. Being the appendix to "Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion." By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in the Seabury Divinity School. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This appendix having been issued separately, in pamphlet form, we propose to notice it upon its own merits, reserving for another notice the very timely and useful work to which it is added. For, indeed, the connection between the two is not immediately obvious. It consists, for the most part, in carrying the *method* which prevails in the larger work into the consideration of the super-added topic. It is contended that the question of what is essential to the being of the Christian Church should not be considered as an abstract one, or depend merely upon an exegetical inquiry; but upon this last as interpreted by its history—and this its entire history. For, as this has been a progression and a development, and the Christian Institution has not been a mere Procrustean bed, into which all manner of concrete situations were to be thrust, but a living thing, of marvellous flexibility and varied and exhaustless resources, the whole career of it should be studied in order to separate what is essential and unchangeable from what is adventitious and capable of change.

This appendix is a most vigorous piece of polemic writing, and one cannot help admiring its sustained strength and ample resources of expression, as notable merits apart from the thought which is conveyed. And it is a very strong plea for the view which the author maintains. He holds up to some degree of scorn the view against which his polemic is directed. No doubt, this, too, has been advocated in an intemperate spirit and presuming manner, and Dr. Sterrett may have felt that he had a perfect right to give a "Roland for an Oliver." But invective is a weapon which wounds rather than slays. In this kind of writing it seldom happens that full justice is done to the argument and position of the adversary. A clear, calm, temperate presentation of the view to be contested, bringing out its full strength and plausibility, by a critique equally calm and temperate—this is the highest kind of controversial writing, and likely to be most convincing and permanent in its result.

The hints or suggestions in this pamphlet as to the best things that can be immediately done to bring about Christian unity do not claim to be ex-

haustive or even deeply meditated, but are hazardous to take, with others, their chance. There is need here for Christian patience, but the longing will, some day, find its supply.

Dr. Sterrett has been faulted for his motto, "*Ubi Spiritus, ibi Ecclesia*," and with some degree of justice. But a similar faulting might be made of the correlative, upon which others lay the emphasis, "*Ubi Ecclesia, ibi Spiritus*," and upon the same grounds. Neither statement nor arm of the dilemma is exhaustive, or should be considered separately; and even the whole is by no means a complete and satisfying definition, and confuses rather than clarifies thought.

If by "*Spiritus*" is meant anything that can be determined and taken as evidence of the "*Ecclesia*," it must mean the unique manifestation of the Holy Spirit's influence, as shown in the peculiar graces of the Christian character. And, if so, it is manifest that these show themselves in various ways and in variant degrees among all the different bodies calling themselves Christian. And, indeed, it would require an analysis more successful than any one has succeeded yet in making, to separate these by a clear line of distinction from similar virtues in the outlying world. Thus, then, no accurate meaning can be given to this word "*Spiritus*," occurring in this connection, and the inference would be quite legitimate that any manifestation of righteousness, of strict moral obedience and self-sacrifice would be evidence that then and there existed the "*Ecclesia*." But this would be begging the question, and ignores the signification of the word: which others hold to mean, and which undoubtedly first meant, a providential selection from the whole of mankind to constitute an Institution, which, because of its Divine origin, must have its essential and visible marks, and to which special promises were made and unique gifts imparted.

But if, on other grounds, argumentative and historical, or merely assertive, one has convinced himself that such an Institution exists—and if, aside from the criticism which such a claim admits of, he asserts that the "*Spiritus*" or the peculiar graces resulting from the Divine influence are there and nowhere else, it is a claim that can be validated by no evidence that, at this period of the world's life, is convincing.

If, *ex hypothesi*, there be an Institution on the earth having all the essential marks, and having existed in unbroken continuity; and if there be, besides, existing other bodies ecclesiastical wanting in some of these particulars, and thus further from the ideal perfection, then an analysis would be required to furnish evidence that the "*Spiritus*" was present in greater degree and with completer harmony in the result of his activity in the former than in the others. If this could be done, it would be a very fine piece of work. It would consist in taking up the best results of each system, in its most saintly individuals, and comparing them as to the entire religious character. It might be found that the one was internally harmonious, as the others were not, notwithstanding that single virtues or graces might be exhibited in the highest degree. But the time is not yet for such a comparison, even though it were possible for the adherent of any system to make it with entire dispassionate-ness.

The questions as to the origin of the Christian ministry, its ideal constitution, and its mode of transmission, are not so easily solved as the advocates of rival replies imagine, seeing that they do not convince each other. The view which Dr. Ster-

rett presents and the one he combats have each their strength and plausibility. A *via media* may be possible which shall recognize the element of truth in each, and relate them properly to each other. The mists which are roused by intemperate controversy obscure the Divine light, which will one day shine down and make this way visible.

In considering all these questions enough use has not been made of the category of *final cause*.

If the result aimed at, in the Divine interference, is the creation of the holy character, in the purity and the might of the loving, sacrificing spirit, and the result for such an one of his individual perfection and salvation, then incontestably this result is reached in any and all the Christian bodies; and there is no higher evidence possible that here has been busy the Holy Spirit.

But if, on the other hand, the result aimed at by the Institution of the Christian Church is something more than this; if it claims to possess a system of means and appliances—sacraments and channels of grace—to produce rapid and symmetrical development of the holy character, then its claim, however denied or doubted, demands examination; and if found true, will be ultimately vindicated by its own success.

And if, besides, the aim of the Christian Church is to war with the principle of evil, and gather adherents till it evangelize the world; if it is, or contains a leaven to affect the whole of human society and human welfare, then it is essential to its full success in these particulars that it shall be at unity with itself. Otherwise it is not the aggressive force which can work with full power upon whatever is objected to it. Its strength is dissipated. It is not the perfect channel through which the Holy Spirit can work most powerfully. The mystical influence, and the providential scheme are not in entire agreement.

The question arises whether the "Unity" demanded is to be superimposed from without, and as a consequent of confident assertions, or whether it is to spring up from within, and be the result of a final, free, easy, willing and glad acquiescence; in other words, whether the system, ideally and actually complete already, is to produce the general diffusion of the perfected Christian character; or whether the diffusion and intensity of the loving spirit is ultimately to clarify its own vision, heal all the wounds, slough off the excrescences, cause healthy growth, and thus perfect the system, which in turn will react upon it, and hasten the speed of its work, and the final consummation.

J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

FARIBAUT, MINN.

NEW POINTS TO OLD TEXTS. By JAMES MORRIS WHITON. Ph.D. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 255, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Mr. Whiton publishes in this volume the third series of his "Summer Sermons in England," the present series having been preached at various places—Glasgow, Edinburgh, and London—between August 4th and September 8th, 1889. There are twelve in the series, and they are arranged in the order of their delivery. The hope of the author is that in their printed form they may be "helpful to those who are thinking upon the problems of life and studying the current questions of Christian thought." The range of subjects is quite varied, and the spirit of the writer broad and catholic. As a general thing the style is plain and direct, though occasionally there are passages which require to be read a second time, and which must have fallen heavy on the listening ear.

Occasionally the tone is rather hasty and the characterization of the views of others severe. Some may take earnest and honest exception to some of his implications. Lack of agreement as to definitions will account for some of his tilts at the "Pharisees." In the sermon entitled "Better than a Book Religion" (p. 36), we find the following: "That the Bible is inspired no man can doubt whose conscience has felt its moral power, for the quickening of moral and spiritual life. That the Bible is infallible, there is not a particle of evidence beyond the assertion of men who imagine that it ought to be, and whose assertion, when sifted, means only that their interpretation of it is infallible. The more you assert the infallibility of the book, the more you perpetuate the divisions of the sects, each coveting that supreme authority for its own views, the more irreconcilably the more they are persuaded of the infallibility of the Bible as they understand it."

Evidently we have here two conceptions of inspiration, one of which is more explicit and inclusive than the other, and at the same time capable of exacter definition. The author merely denounces those who hold it with all its implications, but does not undertake the more difficult task of formulating a substitute and advocating its adoption in his own specific terms.

C. R. GILLET.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Allard, Paul. La Persecution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'Eglise. Paris: Lecoffre, 1889. 2 vols., pp. xlviii., 459, 442, 8vo.

Amelineau, E. Les actes des martyrs de l'Eglise copte, étude critique. Baugé: Daloux, 1890. Pp. 319, 8vo.

Anspach, J. M., Rev. A. M. Divine Rod and Staff in the Valley of the Shadow of Death; or, Consoling Thoughts for the Dying and Bereaved. New York and London: Funk, 1890. Pp. xvi., 281, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Atkins, F. A. Moral Musceteer, and How to Use It. New York and Chicago: Revell. Pp. 96, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Bacuez, L. Das heilige Messopfer und der Priester. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. viii., 309, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Barges, J. J. L. Notice sur quelques antels chrétiens du moyen âge, avec description des lieux où ils ont été découverts. Paris: Goupy, 1890. Pp. 119, 8vo.

Bassett, Jas., Rev. Persia: Eastern Mission. A Narrative of the Founding and Fortunes of the Eastern Persia Mission; with a Sketch of the Versions of the Bible in the Persian and Persian-Turkish Languages. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. of Publ., 1890. Pp. ii., 353, 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Belleli, Lazare. Deux versions peu connues du Pentateuque faites à Constantinople au xv. siècle. Versailles: Cerf, 1890. Pp. 16, 8vo.

Berthe, A., B.D. Essai sur la vie monastique. Montauban: Granicé, 1890. Pp. 86, 8vo.

Bodley, J. E. C. Roman Catholicism in America: (also) The Catholic Democracy in America. Baltimore: Murphy, 1890. Pp. i., 77, 8vo, paper, 25 cts.

Brawley, E. M., D.D. The Negro Baptist Pulpit: A Collection of Sermons and Papers on Baptist Doctrine and Missionary and Educational Work, by Colored Baptist Ministers. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 300, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Böhringer, Adolf, Dr. Kant's Erkenntnis-theoretischen Identismus. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 86, 4to, 1.50 mk.

Brown, R. D. Plain Sermons on the Fundamental Truths of the Catholic Church. London: Burns, 1890. Pp. 467, 8vo, 6s.

Brugsch, Heinrich. Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter. Nach den Denkmälern bearbeitet. Namen Register. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 750, 772, 8vo, 50 pf. (Complete with Register, 16.50 mk.)

Brunnhöfer, Herm. Giordano Bruno's Lehre vom Kleinsten als die Quelle der prästabilierten Harmonie von Leibnitz. Leipzig: Rauert, 1890. Pp. 63, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Butterworth, Hezekiah, A. M. The Story of the Tunes for Home Reading, Praise Meetings, and Lectures on Sacred Music. Illustrated with anecdotes. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 257, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Cannegieter, T. De bevoegdheid tot regeling van het beheer van de Kerkelijke goederen der hervormde gemeenten berust by de algemeene Synode. Utrecht, 1890. Pp. iv., 219, 8vo, 5 mk.

Cargin, James, Rev. Ritualism, Romanism, and the New Testament. Londonderry: Bib. Soc., 1890. Pp. iv., 188, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Carr, W. G. Scriptural Outlines by Books and Themes. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 162, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Cavanagh, Pius, Father (ed.). The Life of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor. London: Burns, 1890. Pp. vi., 254, 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Churton, Edward T., Rev. The Missionary's Foundation of Doctrine, with Practical Reflections. London: Masters, 1890. Pp. xx., 344, 8vo, 5s.

Cocconnier, Marie-Thomas. L'Ame humaine. Existence et Nature. Poitiers: Blais, 1890. Pp. viii., 490, 16mo.

Cowley, E., Rev., D.D. The Writers of Genesis and Related Topics, illustrating Divine Revelation. New York: Th. Whitaker, 1890. Pp. 184, 12 mo, \$1.

Dalman, Gustav H., Dr. Jesaja III. Das Prophetenwort vom Sühneliden des Heilsmitlers mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der synagogalen Literatur erläutert. (Nr. 25 of Schriften des Instituts judaicum zu Leipzig.) Leipzig: — 1890. Pp. 60, 8vo. (New York, 40 cts.)

Dana, James D., LL.D. The Genesis of the Heavens and the Earth and all the Host of Them. Hartford, Conn.: The Student Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. 70, 12mo, 60 cts.

Delarc, O. Saint Gregoire VII. et la réforme de l'Eglise au xie. Siecle. Tome 1^{re}. Abbeville: Retaux, 1890. Pp. 532, 8vo.

Denominational (The) Reason Why: Giving the Origin, History, and Tenets of the Christian Sects, with the Reasons Assigned by Themselves for their Specialties of Faith and Forms of Worship. Rev. and enl. London: Houlston, 1890. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Doctrine Chrétienne, Vérité catholique. Preuves et objections; par l'abbé P. S. Citeaux: Saint Joseph, 1890. Pp. 180, 12mo.

Douglas, Hester. The Land where Jesus Christ Lived. London: Nelson, 1890. Pp. 304, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Drexler, Wilhelm. Der Cultus der ägyptischen Gottheiten in den Donau-Ländern. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. 8vo, 4.40 mk.

Drummond, H. The Perfected Life: The Greatest Need of the World. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, paper, 20 cts.

Drummond, H. Love, the Supreme Gift: The Greatest Thing in the World. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, paper, 20 cts.

Du Cange, Carolo du Fresne, Domino. Glossarium ad scriptores medie infime græcitat. Effigies recens, cum veter editione anni 1688 prorsus congruens Anastat.-Neudruck in 10 Fasc. Fasc I. Breslau, 1890. Pp. 218, fo. (New York, \$3.70.)

Eberle, Karl, Dr. Der Tricenarius des heiligen Gregorius. Eine Abhandlung über den kirchlichen Gebrauch der Gregoriusmessen. Regensburg: Pustet, 1890. Pp. 103, 8vo, 1 mk.

Eichhorn, Karl. Akten zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte. (Von R. Rocholl.) Leipzig: Naumann, 1890. Pp. iii., 39, 8vo, 75 pf.

Estienne d'Orviers, la comtesse d'Sainte Thérèse. Paris: Didot, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Eyton, R. The Apostles' Creed. Sermons. London: Paul, 1890. Pp. 194, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Fillion, L. Cl. La Sainte Bible (texte latin et traduction française), commentée d'après la Vulgate et les textes originaux, à l'usage des séminaires et du clergé. Tom 2. Tours: Mame, 1890. Pp. 712, à 2 col., 8vo.

Fillion, L. Cl. et Nicole, H. Atlas géographique de la Bible, d'après les documents anciens et les meilleures cartes françaises, anglaises et allemandes contemporaines. Paris et Lyon: Delhomme, 1890. Pp. vi., 62, à 2 col., 4to.

Finger Testament. The New Testament. Translated out of the Original Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Nelsons, 1890. 96mo, cloth.

Forster, R. V., D.D. Old Testament Studies: An Outline of Old Testament Theology. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 370, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Fugger, Raimund Ludwig, Graf. Ludwig d'Orléans, Bischof von Amiens. Ein Lebensbild aus dem 18. Jahrhundert. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. viii., 103, 8vo, 1 mk.

Gallagher, Mason, Rev. The True Historic Episcopate as seen in the Original Constitution of the Church of Alexandria, with Introduction by J. McDowell Leavitt, D.D. New York: Funk, 1890. Pp. xxxvi., 342, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Gardiner, Frederic. Aids to Scripture Study. Boston and New York: Houghton, 1890. Pp. ix., 284, 12mo, \$1.25.

Gerlach, Mart. v. Der Mensch im Stande der Schuld nach dem Buch Jesaja. Exegetisch herausgestellt und zusammenfassend dargelegt. Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. vii., 171, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Glasebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. Senior Course. Vol. 1: The Creation to the Death of Saul. London: Percival, 1890. Pp. 348, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Gordon, Henry Francis. The Great Pyramid in, but not of, Egypt: Its Claims to be for a Sign, and for a Witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the Land of Egypt, as Announced in the Scriptures of His Holy Prophet, Isaiah, n.c. 714. 2d ed. (1st ed. written under the name "Badger.") Introduced by Mrs. Piazza Smyth. London: Banks, 1890. Pp. 68, 8vo, 6d.

Gossner, Johs. Die heiligen Schriften des neuen Testaments mit Erklärungen und Betrachtungen. IV. Theil. Das Evangelium Johannes. Hamburg: Ev. Buchhandlung, 1890. Pp. 320, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Gottlieb, Christ oder Antichrist? Beiträge zur Abwehr gegen Angriffe auf die religiöse Wahrheit. 2. Bd.: Der Krach von Wittenberg. Blicke auf den religiösen Wirrwarr der Gegenwart. Berlin: Germania, 1890. Pp. 683, 8vo, 4.30 mk.

Groot, Fr. J. V. de. Summa apologetica de ecclesia Catholica ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Regensburg: Verlage-Anstalt, 1890. 2. Bde. Pp. xi., 394, viii., 308, 8vo, 10 mk.

Grouchy, Le Vicomte de. Documents inédits sur Blaise Pascal, suivis de son testament et de son billet d'enterrement. Paris: Daupeley-Gouverneur, 1890. Pp. 17, 8vo.

Grundzüge der Missionswissenschaft, nebst einigen auszuführenden Vorschlägen und einem Anhang von Satorius Episcopus. Berlin: Schudeier, 1890. Pp. viii., 112, 8vo, 5 mk.

Halévy, J. Recherches bibliques. 106 fascicule. Versailles: Cerf, 1890. Pp. 417-470, 8vo.

Hartel, W. v. Patristische Studien. IV. Zu Tertullian de oratione, de baptismo, de pudicitia, de ieiunio, de anima. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 90, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Hartmann, F. In the Pronaos of the Temple of Wisdom. Containing the History of the True and the False Rosicrucians. London, 1890. Pp. 126, 8vo, 8s.

Hassano Bar Bahlule. Lexicon Syriacum, Voces syriacæ græcæque cum glossis syriacis et arabicis completens c. pluribus codicibus edidit et notis instructis Rubens Duval. Fasciculus secundus. Paris: Bouillon, 1890. Pp. xxiii., xxxiv., 349-780, 4to, à 2 col., 20 fr.

Hauréau, B. Des poèmes latins attribués à Saint Bernard. Paris: Klincksieck, 1890. Pp. 102, 8vo.

Hefele, C. J. v. Conciliengeschichte. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet. 6. Bd. 2. Auflage, besorgt von A. Knöpfer. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. xviii., 1091, 8vo, 12 mk.

Hemenway, Francis. Life and Selected Writings of —, late Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Literature in the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. (By Prof. C. F. Bradley, A. W. Patton, and C. M. Stuart.) Cincinnati and Chicago: Cranston, 1890. \$2.

Hibbard, F. G., D.D. Eschatology; or, The Doctrine of the Last Things, According to the Chronology and Symbolism of the Apocalypse. New York: Hunt, 1890. Pp. vii., 390, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Hillebrand, Alfr., Prof., Dr. Die Sonnenwendfeste in Alt-Indien. Eine Untersuchung. Erlangen: Junge, 1889. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Horton, Robert F. Inspiration and the Bible: An Inquiry. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. x., 256, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Innes, A. Taylor. Church and State: A Historical Handbook. (Handbooks for Bible classes and private students.) Edinburgh: Clark, 1890. Pp. 275, 8vo, 3s.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster, D.D. A Study in Comparative Symbolics. The Lutheran Movement in England during the reigns of Richard VIII. and Edward VI., and its Literary Monuments. Philadelphia: Fredericks, 1890. Pp. xv, 376, svo, \$2.

Janet, Paul. Eléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale. Paris: Delagrave, 1890. Pp. 339, 12mo.

Kaufmann, David, Prof. Dr. Franz Delitzsch. Ein Palmbaum aus Juda auf sein frisches Grab. Berlin: Jüdischen Presse, 1890. Pp. 22, 8vo, 50 pf.

Kessler, W. Die asaphitische Psalmengruppe in Beziehung auf Mackabäische Lieder untersucht. Halle a. S.: Waisenhaus, 1890. Pp. ii, 32, 8vo.

Klötli, W. Shakespeare als religiöser Dichter. Zürich: Hohl, 1890. Pp. 107, 8vo, 1.70 mk.

Krall, Jak. Studien zur Geschichte der alten Aegypten. IV. Das Land Pont. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 82, svo, 1.60 mk. (I-IV., 5.70 mk.)

Kremer, A. R., Rev., A.M. A Biographical Sketch of John Williamson Nevins, D.D., LL.D. Reading, Pa.: Miller, 1890. Pp. 235, 12mo.

Kurt, R. Willensfreiheit? Eine kritische Untersuchung für Gebildete aller Kreise. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. Pp. 136, svo, 2.40 mk.

Lahondès, Jules de. Toulouse chrétienne. L'Eglise Saint-Etienne, cathédrale de Toulouse. Toulouse: Donladore-Privat, 1890. Pp. xiv., 482, 8vo.

Lang, John Marshall. Gideon and the Judges: A Study, Practical and Historical. (Men of the Bible.) London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 201, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Lea, Henry Charles, LL.D. Chapters from the Religious History of Spain. Connected with the Inquisition. Philadelphia: Lea, 1890. Pp. xii, 522, 12mo.

Letourneau, C. Science et Materialisme. Paris: Reinwald, 1890. Pp. viii., 470, 18mo.

Lewis, W. H., D.D. The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870. Nashville, Tenn.: M. E. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. 460, 8vo. (Vol I., published 188—, 2d vol. in course of preparation.)

Lunn, Henry S., Rev. A Friend of Missions in India. The Cyclostyled Indian Journal of Rev. Henry S. Lunn. Edinburgh: Clarke, 1890. Pp. 152, 8vo, 1s.

McCave, Canon, and Breen, J. D., Rev. "Continuity" or Collapse? Ed. by Rev. J. B. Mackinlay. (The Alcester Lectures.) London: Art and Book Co., 1890. Pp. 108, 8vo, 1s.

McMurry, Frank. Herbert Spencer's Erziehungslehre kritisch untersucht. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. 8vo, 1 mk.

Mahler, Ed., Dr. Maimonides' Kiddusch Hachodesch. Uebersetzt und erklärt. Wien: Lippe, 1890. Pp. iv., 115, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Martyn, Carlos. Wendell Phillips the Agitator. With an appendix containing three of the orator's masterpieces. New York and London: Funk & W., 1890. Cloth.

Maurus, Eliscée-Vincent, D.D. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la philosophie cartésienne. Etudes de doctrines comparées. Paris: Quelquejeun, 1890. 2 vols., pp. 511, 459, 18mo.

Meyer, F. B., Rev., B.A. Tried by Fire: Expositions of the First Epistle of Peter. London: Morgan, 1890. Pp. 228, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Miller, J. R., Rev. Come Ye Apart: Daily Readings in the Life of Christ. London: Nelsons, 1890. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Mirbt, C., Prof. Die Entstehung des Papsttums. Vortrag. [Heft 45 of Flugschriften des evangelischen Bundes.] Leipzig: Braun, 1890. Pp. 30, 8vo, 40 pf.

Moinet, C., Rev. The Great Alternative, and other Sermons. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 290, 8vo, 6s.

Monfat, A., Rev. Le Missionnaire des Samoa. Mgr. L. Elloy, de la Société de Marie, évêque titulaire de Tipasa. Paris: Vie, 1890. Pp. 466, 8vo.

Mortimer, Alfred G., Rev. Learn of Jesus Christ to Die: Addresses on the Way of our Lord on the Cross, Taken as Teaching the Way of Preparation for Death. London: Masters, 1890. Pp. x., 104, 16mo, 2s.

Müller, Adf. Die philosophische und die christliche Gewissheit über die Unsterblichkeit der Menschenseele. Ein Vergleich mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von G. Teichmüller's Schrift über diesen Gegenstand. Altenberg, 1890. 8vo, 60 pf.

Müntz, —. Les constructions du pape Urbain V. à Montpellier (1364 à 1370) d'après les archives secrètes du Vatican. Paris: Leroux, 1890. Pp. 23, 8vo.

Murphy, J. B. C., Rev. Through Fast and Festival: Being a Complete Set of Sermons for the Christian Year. Part 4. London: Skeffington, 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Murray, David Christie, and Hermann, Henry. The Bishop's Bible. New York: Lovell Co., 1890. Paper, 50 cts.

Newton, Richard, Rev., D.D. Illustrated Rambles in Bible Lands. Philadelphia: Am. S. S. Un., 1890. Pp. viii., 254, 8vo, \$1.50.

Nirschl, J. Prof., Dr. Die Therapeuten. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. 56, 8vo, 60 pf.

Nöldeke, Th. Delectus Veterum carminum Arabicorum. Carmina selecta et edita. Th. N. Glossarium confect A. Müller (in Porta Linguarum Orientalium Series). Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xvi., 249, 12mo, \$2.60.

Parisis, Mgr. Evêque de Langres. Liberté de l'Eglise. Du silence et de la publicité. Paris: Petitjeu, 1890. Pp. 101, 18mo.

Petitot, Émile. Accord des mythologies dans la cosmogonie des Danites arctiques. Paris: Bouillon. 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Philippi, Friedr. Ad. Kirchliche Glaubenslehre. V. Die Zueignung der Gottesgemeinschaft. 3. Abth. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. 292, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Planudis, Maxim. Monachi. Epistulae. Editit Max Tren, Breslau, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo. New York, \$2.50.

Plümacher, O. Der Kampf um's Unbewusste. Nebst einem Verzeichniss der Hartmann. Literatur von 1868-90. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. 2 Aufl., pp. x., 174, 8vo, 4 mk.

Polek, Joh., Dr. Der Protestantismus in der Bukowina. Czernowitz: Pardini, 1890. Pp. 114, 8vo, 1 mk.

Pooler, L. A. A Short History of the Church of Ireland. Belfast: Olley, 1890. Pp. 174, 8vo, 1s. 4d.

Povey, J. M. Nunnery Life in the Church of England; or, Seventeen Years with Father Ignatius. By Sister Mary Agnes. Edited, with a Preface, by W. Lancelot Holland. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 249, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Preuss, G. Die Prophetie Joel's unter besonderer Rücksicht der Zeitfrage. Inaugural Dissertation von Halle a. S., 1889. Pp. iv., 134, 8vo.

Pulsford, John. Loyalty to Christ. (The Personal and Historic Christ.) Vol. I. "These Sayings of Mine." London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 350, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Reade, H. L. The Story of a Heathen and his Transformation. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. v., 82, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Reinell, Wilhelm, Dr. Luther, Crotus und Hutten. Eine quellenmässige Darstellung des Verhältnisses Luthers zum Humanismus. Marburg: Ehrhardt, 1890. Pp. viii., 134, 8vo (\$1), 2.70 mk.

Reinisch, L. Das Zalmot 4. und 9 in den chamitisch-semitischen Sprachen. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 40, 8vo, 80 pf.

Riehm, E. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von A. Brandt. Lieferungen 11-13. Halle a. S.: Strien, 1890. Pp. viii., 321-562, 8vo, 5 mk. (2 vols. complete, 20 mk.)

Rocholl, —. Zur Weltstellung des israelitischen Volkes (Schriften des Instituts judaicum, Nr. 26.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 15, 8vo, 40 pf.

Rubin, S., Dr. Kurzgefasste Encyclopädie aller Wissenschaften mit Hinblick auf deren Gestaltung im Alterthum, resp. im biblischen Zeitalter (in hebräische Sprache). Wien: Lippe, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, 2 mk.

Sabatier, A. De la vie intime des dogmes et de leur puissance d'évolution. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 1 fr.

Schleiermacher's Sermons. The Foreign Biblical Library. Edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D. New York: Funk & W., 1890. Cloth.

Schulze, Gust. Carl Alb. Pietismus, Ritschliche Theologie und Luthertum. Hannover: Feesche, 1890. Pp. 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

Selle, F. De aramaisms libri Ezechielii. Inaug.-Diss. von Halle. Halle: Kaemmer, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo.

Sepp, Johann W. Bernhard, Prof. Dr. Kritische Beiträge zum Leben Jesu und zur neuteamentliche Topographie Palästinas. Beilage: Neue Forschungen über die Felsenkuppel in Jerusalem. München: Lindauer, 1890. Pp. 173, viii., 28, 8vo, 3 mk.

Shedd's, Dr. "The Proposed Revision of the Westminster Standards," Some Comments upon. Boston: Dammell, 1890. Pp. 92, 12mo.

Shurman, Jacob Gould. Belief in God: Its Origin, Nature, and Basis. Winkley Lectures, Andover Theological Seminary, 1890. New York: Scribner, 1890. Cloth, \$1.25.

Smith, Charles Edward. The World Lighted. A Study of the Apocalypse. New York and London: Funk, 1890. Pp. v., 218, 12mo, 75 cts.

Stähelin, O. Observationes criticae in Clementem Alexandrinum. (I. De codicibus et editionibus. II. De singulis locis.) Diss. inaug. Erlange: Jauge, 1890. Pp. 43, 8vo.

Steidl, Adf. Die Missionen der Kapuziner in der Gegenwart, nach authentischen Berichten zusammengestellt. Meran: Jaudi, Pp. 112, 8vo, 2 mk.

Stock, Otto, Dr. Kantianismus und Kriticismus. I. Das Problem der Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Stargard Fock: 1890. Pp. 22, 4to, 1 mk.

Strong, James, Prof. Sacred Idyls. A Metrical Version of Solomon's Song. With Appropriate Explanations. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. 74, 4to, \$1.50.

Tarn, Rabben. Das Buch vom rechten Lebenswandel, angeblich von R. T., nach den ältesten und correctesten Ausgaben zum ersten Male in's Deutsch übertr. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1890. Pp. 142, 8vo, 1 mk.

Todd, Elbert, S., D.D. Christian Missions in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Hunt, 1890. Pp. ii., 174, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Totten, Charles A. L. Joshua's Long Day and the Dial of Ahaz. A Scientific Vindication and a Midnight Cry. New Haven: Our Race Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. lxxvi., 233, 12mo, 75 cts.

Van Dyke, Henry J., Rev., D.D. The Church: Her Ministry and Sacraments: Lectures Delivered at Princeton, 1890. New York: Randolph, 1890. Pp. ix., 265, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Vincent, Marvin R., D.D. Word Studies in the New Testament. Vol. III. The Epistles of Paul, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xi., 565, 8vo.

Waldmeier, Theophilus. Autobiography. Being an Account of Ten Years' Life in Abyssinia and Sixteen Years in Syria. London: Partridge, 1890. Pp. 336, 8vo, 2s.

Watkins, Henry Wm., M.A., D.D. Modern Criticism. Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. xxxix., 592, 8vo, \$5.

Watkinson, W. L., Rev. Lessons of Prosperity and Other Addresses Delivered at Noonday in the Philosophical Hall, Leeds. London: Wesl. Conf. Off., 1890. Pp. 179, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Welz, J. V., Baron. Der Missionsweckruf, in treuer wiederzugeben des orig. Drucks vom Jahre 1964. (Faber's Missionsbibliothek, Nr. 1.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. iv., 68, 8vo, 1 mk.

Werchowsky, I. Stimme eines griechisch-katholischen Christen gegen den Papiasmus. Aus dem Russischen. Mit einem Vorwort des Verfassers zur deutschen Ausgabe. Leipzig: Schmaler, 1890. Pp. xiv., 94, 8vo, 4 mk.

Wolff, Hermann, Dr. Handbuch der Ethik. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. Pp. xii., 194, 8vo, 2 mk.

Zahn, Th. Die soziale Frage und die innere Mission nach dem Brief des Jakobus. (Bibliothek für innere Mission. Nr. 2.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 23, 8vo, 50 pf.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

In view of the reprints of the 1847 edition of Webster's Dictionary by means of photography, now on sale, it is pleasant to call attention to the new Webster recently issued by the Messrs. Merriam. This edition bears the title of the "International." It is largely a new work, for upon it a band of specialists and editors have been laboring for the past ten years, under the management of ex-President Porter, of Yale. Being brought out in finished form and in one volume, it is of course more immediately useful than the *Century Dictionary*. The illustrations are numerous and good.

THE CENTURY for November has the following contents: "An American in Tibet," an account of a journey through an unknown land; through Northern China to the Koko-nor, by W. Woodville Rockhill (illustrated); "Two French Sculptors: Rodin and Dalon," by W. C. Brownell (illustrated); "The Pawnbroker" (a poem), by Edgar Fawcett; "Life in

the White House in the Time of Lincoln," by John Hay; "The Courageous Action of Lucia Richmond," by Frank Pope Humphrey; "The Epitaph" (a poem), by James T. McKay; "Bereaved" (a poem), by James Whitcomb Riley; "A Legend of Old New York," by the author of "Jufrow van Steen," Anna Eichenberg King (illustrated); "Sunset and Shore" (a poem), by George Parsons Lathrop; "Love, Art, and Time" (a poem), by R. W. Gilder; picture in "Century Series of American Pictures," by Will H. Low; "Colonel Carter of Cartersville," I., by F. Hopkinson Smith (illustrated); "Luca Signorelli" (Italian Old Masters), by W. J. Stillman, with notes and an engraving by T. Cole; "The Instruction of St. Cosmo and St. Damian" (a poem), by Thomas A. Janvier; "Early Victories of the American Navy," new facts from French sources, by Edgar S. Macley (illustrated); "Yesterday" (a poem), by John Vance Cheney; "The Printing of the Century," by Theodore L. De Vinne (illustrated); "On the Andersonville Circuit," by J. T. King (illustrated); "The First Emigrant Train to California," by Gen. John Bidwell (illustrated); "Californiana: Grizzly and Pioneer," by Charles Howard Shinn; "How London is Governed," by Albert Shaw; "The Return of the Dead," by Arlo Bates. These articles are followed by the departments, "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters," and "Brick-a-brac." Several of the articles mentioned belong to series, as do those of Messrs. Rockhill, J. T. King, and Bidwell. The number celebrates its twentieth anniversary fifty by Mr. De Vinne's article. The progress in printing and preparing wood-cuts has been remarkable during the past twenty years.

LIPPINCOTT's for November has this table of contents: "A Laggard in Love," by Jeanie Gwynne Bettany; "Heroines of the Human Comedy," by Junius Henri Browne; "Where lies the Land?" (a poem), by Charles D. Bell; "Some Experiences of a Stump Speaker," by B. F. Hughes; "A Philosopher in the Purple," by G. Barnett Smith; "My Lady Waits" (a poem), by Charles Washington Coleman; "Boud's," by M. P.; "The Famous Sonnet of Arvers" (a poem), translated by M. E. W. Latimer; "Whom Others Envy" (a poem), by Rose Hartwick Thorpe; "Accidents and Trifles," by William Sheppard; "British Side-Glances at America," by Anne H. Wharton; "Journalism versus Literature," by W. J. Henderson; "Book-Talk," by Julian Hawthorne and Melville Phillips; "New Books," "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

SCRIBNER's for November contains several notable articles. Mr. Herbert Ward, the African traveller, tells "The Tale of a Task of Ivory," and Professor N. S. Shaler discourses in ethnography. Lieut. Zogbaum defends the officers of the White Squadron from the charges of undue severity of discipline which have been circulated by the newspapers. The unusual feature of an article written, drawn, and engraved by the same hand appears in "A Day with a Country Doctor," by Frank French. It is doubtful whether the survey of the great railroad in the Andes surpassed in danger and stirring adventures the exploits of the engineering party led by Robert Brewster Stanton, last winter, through the cañons of the Colorado. In less than five hundred miles five hundred and twenty rapids, falls, and cataracts were encountered. Mr. Stanton's expedition. A considerable series of photographs was taken, some of which are used to illustrate the article. A number of nurses in the New York City Training School have written for Mrs. Frederick Rhinelander Jones (who offered prizes for the best) sketches of their actual experiences in a typical day, or night, of hospital work. These are embodied in Mrs. Jones's article "On the Training of a Nurse." Two Sonnets on Cardinal Newman appear, one by Aubrey de Vere, the aged Irish poet, and the other by Inigo Donce, a disciple and friend of the late Cardinal. F. J. Stimson, the author of "Mrs. Knollys" and other short stories collected in "The Sentimental Calendar," contributes "Dr. Materialismus."

HARPER's for November has this table of contents: "Our Italy," by Charles Dudley Warner (illustrated); a paper describing the climate and resources of Southern California; "Too Late!" (a poem), by Julian Hawthorne; "A Halloween Wraith" (a story), by William Black (illustrated); "The World Runs On" (a poem), by Rose Hawthorne Lathrop; "Der Meister-trunk," the festival play of Rothenburg, by E. W. Mealey (illustrated); an interesting description of a quaint old town and of its annual festival play—a play as unique and attractive in its way as the famous passion play at Oberammergau; "A Winter Journey to Japan," by Lafcadio Hearn (from Montreal to Vancouver, and thence across the Pacific to Japan); "A Quatrain" (a poem), by Bliss Carman; "Madriène; or, the Festival of the Dead" (a story), by Grace King; "Princeton University," by Professor W. M. Sloan (the history, methods, and aims of this celebrated institution); "Urban and Commercial Child," by Theodore Child (illustrated); "On Waking from a Dreamless Sleep" (a poem), by Annie Fields; "Switzerland and the Swiss," by S. H. M. Byers (an account of the institutions and people of Switzerland by one who was for sixteen years a resident of that country); "Portraits" (a story), by Ruth Dana Draper; "The Quaker Lady" (a poem), by S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., LL.D. (illustrated); "In November" (a poem), by Archibald J. Campbell; "Fort Tarascon: The Last Adventures of the illustrious Tartarin," VI., by Alphonse Daudet, translated by Henry James (illustrated); Monthly Record of Current Events (to September 17th).